

THE
ANALYSIS
OF
DIVINE FAITH:
OR

TWO TREATISES of the Resolution of *CHRISTIAN BELIEF*:

WITH AN
APPENDIX of SCHISM.

Written by *Henry Holden*, Dr. of Divinity
of the Faculty of *PARIS*.

Translated out of Latine into English by W.G.

Whereunto is annexed an Epistle of the
Author to the Translator, in answer of Dr.
Hammond and the Bishop of *Derry's* Treatises of *SCHISME*.

*How great things hath he commanded our Fathers, that
they should make them known to their children, that
the generation to come might know them, even the
children which should be born, who should arise and
declare them to their children, Psal. 77. v. 6.*

Printed at *Paris*, 1658.

G:Gregory 8.22.33 5/- from C.A.315 # 360 (8725)



To my Christian Countrymen the meer English Readers, especially those who call themselves of the Church of England, greeting.

MY Friends, this Book written in Latine by that rational and learned Divine Doctor Holden, of the faculty at Paris, a man well known in his person to some, and in his writings to all, or the most part of your English Clergy, was Translated by me for your sakes, whose breeding hath not given you the means to understand the Latine Tongue; to which I have been the rather encouraged by observing, that though it hath been now this five years divulged in England, and passed through two Additions, ye none of our Learned here, have excepted against the Doctrinal part, so that taking for granted *qui tacet consentiri videtur*, who holds his peace seems to consent;

The Translator

I suppose they agree the Scheme of faith there held out, extracted from disputes of the School-men, is not only to be tolerated, but is indeed truly Christian, Lawful, and Orthodox : As for those other Congregations amongst us, who now authorized by the present State, despise the Common-prayer-book as a rag of the Mals, they willingly take this saying into their mouths, that when theeves fall out, true men come by their goods ; for because the English Church hath Bishops, which they assert to be *jure divino*, of *divine institution*, and many other things of Ceremony, Practice, and Belief, in common with the Roman, they will needs have them to be but one Hierarchy, not observing there is between them that great difference of differences, different Communion : But to these men who will have God Almighty to have left only an immediate, miraculous, and Enthusiastical way of informing their soules abstract from all principles of common sense and reason,

To the Reader.

reason, this Book was not intended by the Writer in Latine, nor by me the Translator in English: Not by the Writer, for it was meant by him to the Learned of our heretofore established Church, such as were the Bishops of *Canterbury, Winchester, Norwich*, learned *Hooker* and *Field*, &c. and such as are the Bishop of *Derry*, Doctor *Cosens*, Doctor *Hammond*, Doctor *Taylor*, Doctor *Fearn*, &c. Not by me the Translator, who intend it to such amongst ye, who being unable of your selves to expound what the Fathers and Councils in their Comments upon Scripture say, have yet humility enough to submit your judgments to these and the rest of your Learned Divines agreeing with these; who make the Scriptures interpreted and expounded by the Fathers and Councils of the first 400. or 600. years (for they differ something in time, if I mistake not) the measure and rule of their belief and Practise; according to which measure and rule I was my self trained

The Translator

trained up in the English Church, wherein I continued so long as it stood established here by the Lawes, which being abrogated, I must confess I doe not now know where to find it, though I am not to seek that several worthy persons, sometime Clergymen thereof, do exercise their Functions, in reading the Liturgy, and Preaching in such by-places where they may by connivency of the State be permitted, but yet am little satisfied that these scattered limbs of a body without a Head can properly be called the Church of *England*, of which I will not now dispute; the Doctor here says very much to the question, and all I will say at present is, I was not sorry to meet with his Book, which to my understanding laid a way open for an Union between the Church of *England* and the *Roman*; a Union I must confess I had long desired, but could not apprehend the meanes, not onely in respect of several temporal interests, but also for that I was perswaded that
Church

To the Reader.

Church imposed many things of necessity to be believed and practised, I could not well disjest, from which the reading of this ingenious and moderate Doctor hath freed me, so as I shall not doubt to conclude, that if the several points of Faith here set forth, be all which the Roman Church exacts of necessity to be believed, and I have reason to believe they are all, because I see the Book authorized by that famous University of the Sorban, unquestioned by the Congregation of the Inquisition at Rome, as also uncontradicted by any Divine of that Church; I say I shall not doubt to conclude, that there is nothing so essential as should hinder any one that was really and truly of the late English Church, and well understood what She taught from entering into the Communion of the Roman: the onely Church that I know in the World, which seemes to fulfill those glorious Prophecies so often

mcu-

The Translator, &c.

mentioned in Scripture. God of his
mercy guide ye all.

To



TO THE
R E A D E R.

Here is so much, and such bitter dispute (dear reader) amongst the professors of the name of Christ, in all matters belonging to Religion; And there is so much difference and variety amongst us in divine faith and worship: yea, there is so much contention and debate even amongst us Catholicks, that if it were possible to find out any means how to conjoyne and unite the disagreeing thoughts and minds of all Christians, it ever seemed to me a thing most necessary, and most fit for us all to embrace that course. Wherefore I conceived this small treatise might be useful, being I was perswaded to undertake it upon two motives tending to this effect, and which are indeed the cheif end, and design of this work

The first is, that I certainly know there be diuers Schismaticks, who are intangled

To the Reader.

in those unfortunate chaines, because they do not discern our revealed and Catholick truths, from the opinions of our divines, especially of these latter times : Nor likewise, our Divine and Apostolical institutions, from the Ecclesiastical constitutions of Councils and Popes. Yea, and that which doth much more divert some hereticks from the Catholick truth, is, that they imagine they are bound to maintain under pain of excommunication, or of being ejected out of the Catholick communion, some small abuses in things belonging to Religion, which are crept into the Church, through the carelesse of Bishops, and negligence of Pastours; or perhaps through the ignorance or interest of some inferiour Priests and Ministers.

The second is, that in these times many of our Doctors and Readers of Divinity do so strongly adhear to their opinions, drawn from the articles of our faith, and disputed on both sides in our schools; And hence grow so earnest one against another, as that every own at his pleasure, dares call his adversaries opinion an heresie. And this not only in the heat of disputations in the schools, but publickly in print : yea, and
which

To the Reader.

which is worst, some more passionate then ordinary, are not ashamed to proclaim the same in open pulpit to the people, whilest and where they should preach nothing but the word of God. These evils are only to be cured by God Almightyes providence and goodnesse; for he alone knows, and is able to correct the errors of men, and to reduce their wandring stepps into the way of truth.

Having often seriously cast my thoughts upon this subject, it came into my mind, that this disorder doth chiefly and directly proceed from two principles. For if there be any other cause thereof, it doth only work by chance, and by some accidental occasion. The first is the natural ambiguity and equivocal sense of words, which, as they are now used and applyed, is common to all sorts of terms. The second is, that the true and perfect resolution of our Christian faith is generally mistaken amongst our schoolemen. To clear these two points is my ayme in this enterprise that it be evident what is to be held as certain, what as doubtful in our Christian doctrine. I now therefore labour to evince the resolution of our Christian faith, with most strong and manifest reasons, omitting the

To the Reader.

supports of antient authorities, and the relation of our late Authours opinions, which are commonly cited by almost all controver-tists. This I do, least endeavoring to fram a little book, I should make it swell into a volume

I have divided this treatise into two parts. In the first I treat of faith in general, of the means how to come to know certainly what is of faith, and of the resolution of faith. In the second, I set down the particular articles of our divine and Catholick faith as they are distinguished from the opinions of Divines. Wherein I could not but except from the Catalogue of our articles of faith, many things concerning the authority of General Councils, and of the Pope, which are maintained by very many Divines, as their opinions. Which I humbly propose with all due respect (as it is fit I should) and all submissive obedience to that venerable authority and to the Sea of Rome : leaveing safe and untouched all the probability which such opinions may justly challenge. And I do willingly submit all that I have, or shall ever write, to the judgment of the holy, Catholick, Apostolick, and Roman Church.

A table

A Table.



A Table of the Chapters, Lessons, and matters of this Work.

The first Book.

Containing a manifest resolution of our whole
Christian and revealed faith, considered in
generall.

The first Chapter.

Of Faith considered in generall.

WHat belief is, considered in general; and Lesson 1.
wherein consisteth the certainty of belief

	pag. 2	
Two things to be observed in faith	ib.	
Wherein consists the obscurity of faith	ib.	
The certainty of faith and truth is threefold	3	
Certainty hath three denominations	5	
What it is to be certain	6	
Some admit no certainty	ib.	
There is a certainty in matters of faith	7	
The difference between faith and opinion.	ib.	
Whence it is that faith or belief in general, doth take Lesson 2.	8	
its certainty		
Faith is built upon authority	ib.	
	The	

A Table.

	<i>The ground of authority is two fold</i>	9
	<i>The certainty of our judgment concerning the fidelity and skill of the author of our belief, sheweth from two principles</i>	ib.
	<i>The principle from whence our certainty proceedeth is two-fold</i>	10
	<i>From both principles proceedeth a full certainty</i>	11
	<i>It is one thing for our understanding to be true or truly informed; and another, to be certain</i>	12
	<i>There's two kinds of certainty in Man, the own true and rational, the other passionate and blind</i>	ib.
Lesson 3.	<i>Of the waies and meanes by which the authority or testimony of the reporter ought to come to the believers knowledge</i>	13
	<i>The authority of the reporter, may come two waies to the believer</i>	ib.
	<i>The true certainty of faith supposeth two things</i>	ib.
	<i>The certainty of faith is of an equal degree to the certainty of the know'edge, which the believer hath of the infallibility of the meanes, by which the thing he believeth comes to his hearing</i>	ib.
	<i>The resolution of faith is two-fold</i>	ib.

The second Chapter.

Of the nature of Divine faith considered in general.

Lesson 1.	O <i>F the certainty of divine faith</i>	16
	<i>two opposite errors concerning necessity of divine faith</i>	ib.
	<i>The will doth act in vertue of a precedent judgment</i>	17
		The

A Table.

<i>The nature of the judgment which doth move the will to act, is three-fold</i>	18
<i>An example of one doubting in a thing of humane faith</i>	ib
<i>Alike example of one doubting in divine faith</i>	19
<i>Of divers points necessary to be noted, as requisite to the discussion of divine faith</i>	21
<i>That the authority of God is infallible</i>	ib.
<i>Whence proceeds the variety of belief amongst those, who rely upon Gods authority</i>	ib.
<i>What it is for an act to be supernatural</i>	23.
<i>How an act of faith is supernatural</i>	ib
<i>Whether the certainty of an act of divine faith be supernatural</i>	24
<i>What kind of certainty of faith is that which is grounded upon private and particular mens judgments</i>	25
<i>The certainty of faith grounded upon the instruction of our Pastors</i>	26
<i>That it is a great grace to be a member of the Church</i>	ib.
<i>We ought to find out by discourse, what is to be believed by divine faith</i>	27
<i>That all revealed things are conformable to reason, though opposite to sense</i>	ib.
<i>Revealed things must come into the soul by the senses</i>	28

The third Chapter.

Of the means by which all revealed things are to be known.

Lesson I.

T he state of the question is proposed, and of what quality the means ought to be, is explained	29
The certainty of faith cannot be greater then the certainty of the means	ib.
The opinion of some Divines	31
This opinion doth not differ from those who rely upon the private spirit	ib.
The state of the question	33
The meanes by which revealed things are to be known ought to have two qualities	34
An object may be certainly known by our external senses	35
The manner how the certainty of our senses is effected	36
The operation of one only sense, may beget a certainty	37
The meanes which is to convey and communicate revealed things, ought to be most notorious to our senses	39
It ought likewise to make all men certain of the revelation	40
No kind nor sort of men are excluded from salvation	ib.
There be certain extraordinary waies by which God doth sometimes reveale his secrets	ib.
It was necessary that Christ should provide such a meanes	

A Table.

meanes to his Church, as we have explicated 41

The fourth Chapter

Of those things which are revealed, considered in
general.

<i>Of several kinds of Christian truths, considered in general</i>	Lesson 1. 49
<i>Christian truths may be divided into four classes</i>	ib.
<i>Revealed truths of the first classe</i>	ib.
<i>Cathelick truths of the second classe</i>	ib.
<i>Canonical truths of the third classe</i>	48
<i>Theological truths of the fourth classe</i>	ib.
<i>The truths of the first classe, are articles of faith</i>	49
<i>Two things required to an article of faith</i>	ib.
<i>There be but few articles of faith</i>	
<i>Of divers things which are to be noted as requisite to the particular examination of these truths</i>	Lesson 2. ib.
<i>A necessity of believing some articles of faith in that sense wherein it is disputed by some Divines</i>	50
<i>The resolution of the question in that sense, is unuseful pernicious, and impossible</i>	ib.
<i>Another kind of necessity of believing some articles of faith</i>	51
<i>What signifies this word, fundamental, in matters of faith</i>	52
<i>The comparison of fundamentals, is two-fold</i>	ib.

The

The fifth Chapter.

Whether the holy Scripture can, of itself, be the means whereby revealed truths are to be conveyed, and delivered to the whole Church.

Lesson 1.

What is the holy Scripture? and what it is for the Scripture to be Canonical 59
 The Scripture must be received by the Church 60
 Philosophical truths, are not to be proved out of Scripture ib.
 The authours of canonical books, had only a special inspiration from God in writing doctrinal things 61
 What it is for a written book to be canonical ib.
 Canonical books have a doubtful foundation ib.
 How the universal Church doth know that a book is canonical 62
 The boldnesse of hereticks concerning canonical books 64
 Why the fathers did chiefly use the Scriptures disputing against hereticks ib.

Lesson 2.

The holy Scripture alone, cannot be a convenient means to convey all the revealed tenets of our Catholick faith, to the whole body of the universal Church 65
 The words of the holy Scripture without their sense cannot be a means to convey revealed truths ib.
 There is no one particular expositor of the holy Scripture who is infallible 66
 Hereticks will have us suppose the Bible to be the word of God ib.
 All

A Table.

<i>All defection from the universal Church is unreasonable</i>	68
<i>Hereticks, though they acknowledge the Scriptures, yet have they erred from the truth</i>	69
<i>The ground or fundamental cause of this</i>	70

The sixth Chapter.

Of every particular and private mans ratiocination in relation to the resolution of divine faith

W <i>hether divine faith ought to be resolved into every particular and private mans ratiocination</i>	Lesson 1. 75
<i>The state of the question</i>	76
<i>How this is to be understood that the meanes by which faith is to be conveyed, ought to be notorious to all</i>	77
<i>It is to be supposed here, for the discussion of this question, that here are some revealed things</i>	78
<i>The question may be proposed two waies</i>	79
<i>Ratiocination, cannot be the meanes neither to find out, nor to convey the articles of our faith</i>	ib.
<i>The consequences drawn from points of faith may be of two sorts</i>	80
<i>Some are most evident</i>	81
<i>Some are doubtful</i>	ib.
<i>One may believe all the articles of our faith, and yet not be truly a Catholick in his faith</i>	82

The

A Table.

The fifth Chapter.

Whether the holy Scripture can, of itself, be the means whereby revealed truths are to be conveyed, and delivered to the whole Church.

Lesson 1.

What is the holy Scripture? and what it is for
the Scripture to be Canonical 59
The Scripture must be received by the Church 60
Philosophical truths, are not to be proved out of Scripture ib.
The authours of canonical books, had only a special
inspiration from God in writing doctrinal things 61
What it is for a written book to be canonical ib.
Canonical books have a doubtful foundation ib.
How the universal Church doth know that a book is
canonical 62
The boldnesse of hereticks concerning canonical
books 64
Why the fathers did chiefly use the Scriptures disputing
against hereticks ib.

Lesson 2.

The holy Scripture alone, cannot be a convenient means
to convey all the revealed tenets of our Catholick
faith, to the whole body of the universal Church 65
The words of the holy Scripture without their sense
cannot be a means to convey revealed truths ib.
There is no one particular expositor of the holy Scripture
who is infallible 66
Hereticks will have us suppose the Bible to be the word
of God ib.
All

A Table.

<i>All defection from the universal Church is unreasonable</i>	68
<i>Hereticks, though they acknowledge the Scriptures, yet have they erred from the truth</i>	69
<i>The ground or fundamental cause of this</i>	70

The sixth Chapter.

Of every particular and private mans ratiocination in relation to the resolution of divine faith

W <i>hether divine faith ought to be resolved into every particular and private mans ratiocination</i>	Lesson 1. 75
<i>The state of the question</i>	76
<i>How this is to be understood that the meanes by which faith is to be conveyed, ought to be notorious to all</i>	77
<i>It is to be supposed here, for the discussion of this question, that here are some revealed things</i>	78
<i>The question may be proposed two waies</i>	79
<i>Ratiocination, cannot be the meanes neither to find out, nor to convey the articles of our faith</i>	ib.
<i>The consequences drawn from points of faith may be of two sorts</i>	80
<i>Some are most evident</i>	81
<i>Some are doubtful</i>	ib.
<i>One may believe all the articles of our faith, and yet not be truly a Catholick in his faith</i>	82

The

A Table.

The seventh Chapter.

Of particular inspirations, and instincts of the holy Ghost in as much as they may have relation to the resolution of Christian faith.

Lesson 1.

W Hether divine faith ought to be resolved into the instinct of the holy Ghost, inspired into every particular person	84
The opinion of those who rely upon the private spirit	ib.
Certain hard questions in this matter	85
They reject all authority and reason	86
It is certain that there be some inspirations of the holy Ghost	ib.
What is an instinct of the holy Ghost	87
God doth not work but by the mediation of second causes	88
What is prophesie	89
What is revelation	ib.
The certainty of an external revelation	90
How internal revelations are made	91
Faith cannot be resolved into a private instinct	93
The spirit is not given to all	ib.

The eight Chapter.

Of the universal and Catholick tradition of the revealed articles of our Christian faith.

Lesson 1.

O F universal tradition considered in general	98
What is tradition considered in general	ib.
A tra-	

A Table.

<i>A tradition of a false thing may be unerrable</i>	99
<i>By how much more universal any tradition is, by so much the more secure and strong it is</i>	ib.
<i>Examples of several traditions</i>	100
<i>The ground and foundation of this truth</i>	101
<i>A difference between divine and humane traditions</i>	102
<i>Of the Christian Church</i>	ib. Lesson 2.
<i>Whether it be not some mens office and function to have a care that the tradition of revealed things be continued</i>	ib.
<i>It is and was needful that there should be a Hierarchy</i>	103
<i>What signifies the word Church</i>	105
<i>A double union is necessary in the Church</i>	107
<i>What is properly a member of the Church</i>	108
<i>The definition of the Church</i>	109
<i>Wherein consists the universal and Catholic tradition of Christian and revealed truths</i>	110 Lessons.
<i>What is Religion</i>	ib.
<i>In every Religion there must needs be faith and hope</i>	ib.
<i>Why Religion doth so constantly persevere</i>	ib.
<i>Religion must needs contain both belief and action</i>	111
<i>Rational nature hath a great propension to Religion</i>	ib.
<i>Christ only is the maker of articles of faith</i>	ib.
<i>The number of articles of faith cannot be augmented</i>	ib.
<i>That there are Pastors and Ministers in the Church</i>	112
<i>The method which was used in the planting of the Gospel, was most excellent, and mainly to be observed</i>	113

A Table.

	<i>A Catholick axiome of the tenure of faith</i>	115
	<i>Things revealed and things of Ecclesiastical constitution, have ever been delivered by the Church promiscuously and indistinctly</i>	116
	<i>That the tenure of tradition is infallible is here proved</i>	118
Lesson 4.	<i>Wherein consists chiefly the infallibility of the universal tradition of revealed truths, and whence it is that no error in faith, can be introduced universally into the Catholick Church</i>	121
	<i>The first ground of the certainty of tradition</i>	124
	<i>An example of the impossibility of error in tradition</i>	125
	<i>A confirmation of the infallibility of tradition</i>	126
	<i>An example of this confirmation</i>	127
	<i>What was to be done in the time of the Apostles against a broacher of new doctrine</i>	130
	<i>Why an error cannot be brought into the Church</i>	131
	<i>True faith cannot be changed, neither by reason, nor by authority</i>	132
	<i>Why a mans perswasion of a revealed truth, may not be turned into a contrary perswasion</i>	134
	<i>Three things do hinder an universal change in Religion</i>	135
	<i>Whether an error may not be tacitly brought into the Church</i>	136
	<i>Destroy tradition, and you destroy faith</i>	138
Lesson 5.	<i>Wherein doth the universal tradition of revealed truths differ from the universal tradition of human truths And whether the foundation whereupon the perseverance of Christian faith is grounded, is not more strong then the principles of the continuance of humane nature</i>	139
	<i>The</i>	

A Table.

<i>The first disparity</i>	140
<i>The second disparity</i>	ib.
<i>The third disparity</i>	141
<i>The fourth disparity</i>	142
<i>The fifth disparity</i>	144
<i>A comparison between the tradition of a point of doctrine, and the tradition of a book of the Scripture</i>	147
<i>The first difference</i>	ib.
<i>The second difference</i>	149
<i>Whether the principles of nature, or of Religion are the stronger</i>	150

The ninth Chapter.

Of general Councils and of the Pope

O F the authority of general Councils, in relation to their declarations of revealed truths	153	Lesson I.
<i>The meanes which is to be declarative of what is delivered by tradition must be something that is universal</i>	ib.	
<i>Bishops in Councils are witnesses, no makers of revealed truths</i>	154	
<i>What is of divine institution cannot be changed</i>	155	
<i>The first Councils was of the Apostles themselves</i>	156	
<i>What makes a Council to be a general one</i>	157	
<i>How a general Council can define what is an article of faith</i>	ib.	
<i>How Bishops in a Council can define nothing but truth</i>	158	
<i>The difficulty is greater when those things which are to be defined, are not expressly revealed</i>	159	
2	Councils	

A Table.

<i>Councils have two chief ends</i>	160
<i>What is to be done when such a position is to be examined in a Council, as is neither directly and expressly an article of faith, nor yet an heresie</i>	161
<i>What is required that a divine truth, be an article of faith</i>	ib.
<i>The common distinction of explicit and impleit faith</i>	162
<i>These words have two significations</i>	163
<i>All natural truths are connexed</i>	ib.
<i>Of what force are the decrees of Councils in such things as are not expressly articles of faith</i>	165
<i>There is no Christian truth, which is not in some sort need ul to practise</i>	ib.
<i>Conclusions drawn out of articles of faith, are of two sortes</i>	165
<i>Whether it be lawful to doubt of the decrees of general Councils, when they are concerning sequels drawn from some article of faith</i>	168
<i>Whether any man is obliged to an internal act of faith</i>	ib.
<i>Whether men may be forced to faith</i>	169
<i>Of the Popes authority in relation to his declaring of matters of faith</i>	170
<i>What is the measure of the jurisdiction of the supream head of every society</i>	ib.
<i>The Pope is the head of the Church</i>	ib.
<i>How an opinion is not heretical</i>	172
<i>Every opinion which is disputed amongst Catholicks is free to be held by any</i>	173
<i>What the Pope cannot do</i>	ib.
<i>Whence proceeds the infallibility of the Church</i>	174
<i>What general Councils cannot do, the Pope cannot do</i>	ib. What

A Table.

<i>What the Pope cannot do</i>	175
<i>What it is for the Pope to define, ex Cathedra from his Chair</i>	ib.
<i>What the Pope can do</i>	ib.
<i>The whole Church owes some sort of obedience to the Pope</i>	177
<i>The Pope is to be obeyed, though he be not infallible</i>	ib.
<i>The Pope is S. Peters successor, not in all his priviledges and prerogatives</i>	ib.
<i>No more then other Bishops are to the rest of the Apostles</i>	178
<i>The conclusion of the first part of this treatise</i>	ib.
<i>The circle which some divines fall into in resolving faith</i>	179
<i>The certainty of faith ought to be reasonable</i>	ib.

The second Book.

Of the particular articles of our Christian and Catholick faith, as they are distinguished from other truths, belonging to Christian Religion; And from such tenets as are uncertain, and doubtfully disputed, amongst Catholick Divines.

The first Chapter.

Of certain general heads which are to be presupposed for the more accurate examination of particular articles

What is signified by this word necessary 181
 There be some Catholick truths which are not revealed 183

What

A Table.

<i>What tenets be there, by which all Catholicks are not bound to hold</i>	184
<i>Theological conclusions are excluded out of the catalogue of our articles of faith</i>	185
<i>The Canon law is likewise excluded</i>	ib.
<i>All Ecclesiastical constitutions are likewise excluded</i>	186
<i>The decrees of Provincial Councils are likewise excluded</i>	ib.
<i>All sacred and ceremonious rites, not instituted by Christ, are likewise excluded</i>	ib.

The second Chapter.

All things contained in the Apostles Creed, are necessarily to be believed, as being all of them Catholick truths.

S <i>ome Catholicks maintain divers natural truths as necessary for the upholding of our faith, which truly are not so</i>	187
<i>That there is a God, is a Preamble to faith</i>	189
<i>God is the creator of heaven and of earth</i>	190
<i>The Trinity of persons in God, is to be believed</i>	191
<i>The incarnation of the second person, is to be believed</i>	194
<i>The divinity and personality of the holy Ghost, is to be believed.</i>	197
<i>Christ conceived by the holy Ghost</i>	199
<i>Born of the Virgin Mary</i>	200
<i>Suffered, Crucified, Dead, and Buried</i>	201
<i>Descended into Hell</i>	201
<i>Rise from the dead</i>	ib.
<i>Ascended</i>	

A Table.

<i>Ascended into Heaven</i>	ib.
<i>Sitteth at the right hand of God the Father</i>	203
<i>That he is to come again to judge the World</i>	ib.
<i>That we must believe in the Catholick Church</i>	ib.
<i>The communion of saints</i>	207
<i>The resurrection of the flesh</i>	208
<i>The forgivenesse of sin</i>	ib.
<i>Life everlasting</i>	209
<i>There is no article of faith which some heretick or other, hath not denied</i>	210
<i>The coming of the holy Ghost, ought to be believ- ed</i>	312

The third Chapter.

What is of necessity to be believed of the holy
Scriptures, of General Councils, and of the
Pope.

W <i>hat is of necessity to be believed of the holy</i>	Sect. 1.
<i>Scriptures</i>	214
<i>All the Scripture hath been denied by the hereticks</i>	215
<i>There can be nothing certain in the Scriptures, unlesse we be first certified which they are, and which is their true sense</i>	218
<i>What is of necessity to be believed, touching general</i>	Sect. 2.
<i>Councils</i>	219
<i>What is of necessity to be believed of the Pope</i>	223 Sect. 3.
<i>The Pope head of the Church</i>	ib.
<i>What ever belongs to the Pope by divine right, is im- mutable</i>	223
<i>The Popes perogatives are of two kinds</i>	224
<i>There be divers particular acts specially belonging to the Pope, which are not of Divine right</i>	ib.
<i>The</i>	

A Table.

<i>The Pope may err</i>	225
<i>The Pope is head, But not Lord and Maister of the Touncel</i>	229
<i>Wherein the Popes special authority doth consist</i>	ib.
<i>Every Bishops jurisdiction, is immediately from Christ</i>	227
<i>All exemptions are against the law of God and na- ture</i>	228
<i>The Bishop of Rome is is not an universal Bishop</i>	229
<i>The hereticks do calumniate the Catholick Doctrine</i>	ib.

The fourth Chapter.

What is of necessity to be believed touching the
Sacraments of our Evangelical law.

Sect. 1.	W hat is of necessity to be believed of the Sa- craments in general	230
	Three things are to be believed of the Sacraments in general	231
Sect. 2.	What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacrament of Baptism	233
	What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacrament of confirmation	235
Sect. 3.	What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacra- ment of the Eucharist	237
	Two sorts of transubstantiations	239
Sect. 4.	The manner of this action is altogether unknown	240
	Another manner of the Eucharist, which is likewise altogether unknown	242
	Some other truths annexed to the precedent	243
	What is to be believed of the Sacrifice of the Masse	246
	How the Sacrifice of the Masse is propitiatory	ib.
	What	

A Table.

<i>What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacrament of Penance</i>	248
<i>What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacrament of extreame unction</i>	251
<i>What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacrament of order</i>	252
<i>What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacrament of Marriage</i>	252

The fift Chapter

What is of necessity to be believed, 1. Of original sin? 2. Of mans justification? 3. Of merit and good works? 4. Of grace and free-will? 5. Of satisfaction for sins,

<i>What is of necessity to be believed of original sin</i>	258
<i>What is of necessity to be believed of mans justification</i>	260
<i>What is mans first justification</i>	ib.
<i>What is the beginning of justification to the Adult</i>	261
<i>The causes of justification</i>	ib.
<i>Faith only doth not justifie</i>	262
<i>Justification may be lost and recovered again</i>	ib.
<i>Perseverance is a special gift of God</i>	ib.
<i>We are justified gratis</i>	263
<i>What is of necessity to be believed of merits and good works</i>	265
<i>Good workes are necessary to salvation</i>	ib.
<i>Ther's no good work from Man on'y</i>	266
<i>All good is from God</i>	ib.
<i>Theological questions</i>	ib.
¶ ¶ ¶	What

A Table.

Sect. 4.	<i>What is of necessity to be believed of grace and free-will</i>	269
	<i>The Catholick doctrine in this point</i>	ib.
Sect. 5.	<i>Free-will is an active power</i>	270
	<i>What is of necessity to be believed of satisfaction</i>	272
	<i>Penance is necessary for the recovery of grace</i>	ib.
	<i>The effects of Penance, or painfu^l punishments</i>	274
	<i>All Satisfaction is from the merits of Christ</i>	275
	<i>One cannot satisfie for another</i>	276
	<i>Uncertain tenets disputed amongst divines</i>	277

The sixth Chapter.

What is of necessity to be believed, 1. Of Purgatory ? 2. Of prayer for the dead ? and 3. Of indulgences ?

Sect. 1.	W <i>hat is of necessity to be believed of Purgatory</i>	278
	<i>Why there is a Purgatory</i>	279
	<i>The Churches care, least abuses should creep into it</i>	ib.
	<i>Tenets disputed amongst Divines</i>	280
Sect. 2.	<i>What is of necessity to be believed of prayer for the dead</i>	281
	<i>Tenets disputed amongst Divines</i>	ib.
Sect. 3.	<i>What is of necessity to be believed of indulgences</i>	283
	<i>The solicitude of the Church to take away all abuses</i>	284
	<i>Doubtful positions concerning the paines, which are to be payed in this world</i>	285
	<i>Doubtful positions concerning the paines which are to be payed in the next world</i>	286
	The	

A Table.

The seventh Chapter.

What is of necessity to be believed, 1. Of the invocation of Saints? 2. What of reliques? 3. What of images?

W hat is of necessity to be believed of the invocation of Saints	Sect. 1. 288
Theological questions doubtfully disputed	289
Note the ignorance of our hereticks	290
Examples work much upon men	291
What is of necessity to be believed, concerning the reliques of Saints	293
Two things to be cared for, concerning the reliques of Saints	Sect. 2. ib.
The honor given to Saints, is a Religious honor	294
What is of necessity to be believed of holy images	297
The calumnies of our adversaries	ib.
The Catholick doctrine explicated	198 Sect. 3.
The images of the B. Trinity, and of God, are not approved by any positive authority	ib.
Questions disputed by Divines in this matter	ib.
The fruit of images	299
There may be some abuses in images	ib.

A Table.

The eight Chapter

Of certain articles, or Christian truths, which are of an inferior order, and which do belong to our Christian faith, in as much as they do cleerly follow, either out of the principles which we have laid, and settled above; or are received by all Catholicks; that is, by common and universal consent of the Catholick Church 301

P astoral Mission	303
Traditions are to be observed	304
That there is a power in the Church to make laws	305
Fast. Celebat	306
Festival dates are to be kept	ib.
The Vigils and the 4. Ember weeks are to be kept	307
Plurality of wives forbidden to Christians	ib.
Virginity to be preferred before marriage	308
Doves are lawful	309
Every Christian is uncertain both of his election, and perseverance	310
That the rewards of saints in heaven are unequal	311
That every one hath an Angel Guardian	ib.
Some Angels did fall into sin	313

One only Paragraph

Of the proper signification of such words or termes as are commonly used in the censures of Theological propositions 317

What

A Table.

<i>What it is to resent heresie, or to be neer to heresie</i>	317
<i>What it is for a position to be temerarious</i>	318
<i>That is said to be temerarious, which is asserted upon slight grounds</i>	319
<i>Temerarious is likewise said, because opposite to authority</i>	ib.
<i>What it is to be Erroneous and false</i>	321
<i>An error is more or lesse dangerous according to the divers qualities of the subjects wherein it is</i>	ib.
<i>To whom it doth belong to judge of errors</i>	322
<i>What it is for a position to be scandalous, and offensive to pious eares</i>	323
<i>There is a twofold novelty for which positions may be said to be scandalous</i>	324

The ninth Chapter.

Of certain natural truths, which are in the practise of Christian faith, and Religion, ought to be kept and observed by all Catholicks whosoever, as being indissolvable, and indispensable by any authority upon earth, of what quality soever

W <i>hat is necessarily connexed and consonant to reason, is common to all mankind</i>	325
<i>Two chief natural truths</i>	ib.
<i>What is moral good and moral evil</i>	326
<i>What are the laws of nature</i>	ib.
<i>The law of nature is three-fold</i>	327
<i>What it is to be a law of nature</i>	ib.
<i>The difference between the law of nature, and the right of nature</i>	328
<i>The</i>	

A Table.

<i>The first classe of the laws of nature, relate to God</i>	ib.
<i>The second classe of the laws of nature, relate to our selves</i>	329
<i>The third classe of the laws of nature, to relate to our Neighbour</i>	330
<i>Humane actions may be considered two waies</i>	ib.
<i>The law of nature, relating to our neighbour, considered in common, is two-fold</i>	331
<i>The order of natural love towards our neighbour</i>	332
<i>We are obliged to do good to our neighbour, two waies</i>	ib.
<i>How it is lawful to kill, or cause another mans death</i>	333
<i>The duty of Man towards his Neighbour in particular</i>	335
<i>The duty of man towards his Parents</i>	ib.
<i>Thou shalt not kill, is a law of nature</i>	336
<i>The vices of luxury, are against the law of nature</i>	337
<i>So is also Lying</i>	ib.
<i>How Theft is against the law of nature</i>	338
<i>Man is bound to stand to his promise by the law of nature</i>	339
<i>How a promise differs from a pact, or Covenant</i>	ib.
<i>What is a promise</i>	339
<i>The conditions of a promise</i>	340
<i>What is a promising oath, and what it's conditions</i>	341
<i>What is to be said of a forced oath or promise</i>	ib.
<i>How an oath is dissolueable</i>	ib.
<i>All these laws are of a greater, and more perfect obligation, in the Christian and Evangelical law, then in the law of nature</i>	343

A Table.

A Corollarium, or Superaddition

Of man as he's entred and settled in society

T hree necessary things are established	345
1. That the common good, is to be preferred before a particular good	346
God is, as it were, the common and final good of man	347
2. That man is naturally inclined to society	ib.
From this inclination, followeth communion, and from communion friendship	ib.
Mans necessity of entering into society	348
3. Men are obliged to keep their pacts or Covenants	ib.
The grounds whereupon society is built	ib.
Men are naturally born rational, and free	ib.
The first beginning of the superiority	349
The good of man is three-fold	350
The good of his mind or soul	ib.
The good of his body	ib.
The good of his fortune, or of his temporal and exte- riour estate	ib.
The end of all civillaws	ib.
Obedience due to the civil Magistrat by divine right	351
All created power hath its limits	357
Every Magistrat is lyable to error and sin	ib.
Most wicked, but possible commandements are sup- posed	358
The flatterers of these times	ib.
The first bound or limit of all created power	ib.
The second bound or limit of all civil power	359
The third bound or limit of all civil power	360
	The

A Table.

<i>The fourth and last bound or limit of all civil power</i>	361
<i>Subjects may as well withstand as disobey their superiour commanding unjust things</i>	372
<i>Who is to be judge, betwixt the Magistrate and the subject</i>	378

FINIS

The Approbation.

WE underwritten Doctors in the sacred faculty of Divinity in *Paris*, do certifye and witnesse, that this book, the Title whereof is (*The Analysis of divine faith; or two treatises of the resolution of our Christian belief: written by Henry Holden, Doctor in the sacred faculty of Divinity in Paris.*) which hath been diligently read over by us, doth contain nothing contrary to Catholick faith and Christian manners. Yea we find in it, that the truth of our divine and Christian faith, grounded upon Catholick tradition, is most certainly evinced against hereticks: And the true articles of our said Catholick faith, faithfully distinguished from such tenets as are disputed on both sides by our Divines. In witnesse whereof we have signed hereunto. At *Paris* the 20. of September,

Dreux.

1657:

J. Blondel.



THE
ANALYSIS
OF
DIVINE FAITH:
OR

The resolution of Christian Belief.

The First Book.

*Containing a clear and certain resolution of
Christian and revealed faith in general.*

The First Chapter.

Of Faith or Belief considered in general.



It is evident that in this question which I undertake to discuss, divers things are to be supposed as demonstrated elsewhere, which may be comprehended in four Heads.

Four things
are to be sup-
posed to this
Treatise of the
resolution of
faith.

1. That there is a God.
2. That the rational soul of man is immortal.
3. That some supernatural Religion is needful to mankind since the fall of Adam.
4. That this Religion is only Christian, to wit, which

B

only

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

only is necessary to mankind, and which only contains nothing but truth in every particular point. These all Christians doe acknowledge and profess. But which this true Christian Religion is, or by what meanes it may be certainly known, herein it is we differ. This I conceive ought to be evidenced by resolving of Christian Faith, which therefore I here endeavour to demonstrate. Now the first thing that doth occur to be discussed in the resolution of Christian Faith, is, What is Faith or Belief considered in general.

The First Lesson.

What Belief is considered in general? and wherein consisteth the certainty of Belief?

What faith is.

Belief is an assent of the understanding, which we give to any thing that is told us, grounded upon the testimony or authority of him who tells it. *Faith comes by hearing.* Nor doe we believe but what we hear and think to be true.

Rom. 10.

Two things to be observed in faith.

Two things therefore are to be considered in *Belief* or *Faith*. 1. The judgment or opinion of the believer, whereby he thinks the reporter tells truth. 2. The obscurity which is in the assent of Faith. Concerning this opinion or judgment which is pre-required in the believer, we shall speak hereafter. Concerning Faith's obscurity, it is to be noted, that every assent of belief must of necessity involve some obscurity in it. For being that all intellectual evidence is a clear and perfect knowledge of any thing, either in it self, or in

wherein consists the obscurity of faith.

in something else, which is intrinsically and essentially annexed unto it, as it's cause, or as it's effect: And belief, though it be a kind of knowledge, yet neither is it of the thing believed in it self, nor of any thing else whereunto the thing believed hath any intrinsical or essential connexion, but only of the authority or testimony of the reporter, which is wholly external and accidental to the thing believed, It must therefore necessarily follow, that every assent of faith, though never so certain, must needs involve some obscurity in it. For suppose the believer could demonstrate with most evident arguments, that the reporters testimony were infallible, yet would not this conclude that his knowledge of the thing believed were evident; for that would still remain hidden; and those arguments and convincing reasons would only shew that the believers knowledge of the *inerrability* of the relators testimony (for whose sake he doth assent unto and believe a thing otherwise unknown unto him) were most clear and evident. This I thought fit to note only by the way.

The certainty of belief, as also the truth of the knowledge which is pre-required to faith, and which doth induce us to believe, may be considered three wayes. First, *materially*, as it is in the subject or matter which we believe. And this is called certainty or truth in an improper and equivocal sense: For example, when we believe any thing, it is manifest that the thing in it self hath a determinate certainty or truth in it, that is, it is either conform unto, or different from the

The certainty of faith and truth is three-fold.

Material or subjective.

The analysys of Divine Faith.

Objective, or
from the ob-
ject.

internal act of our belief, how strong or weak soever may be the intellectual adhesion of our assent thereunto. If we believe such a Town is taken, whether our belief be true or false, strong or weak, the thing in it self stands determinately fixed to the one side only. This certitude or truth School-men call *material*. Secondly, the certainty of faith or truth may be considered *formally*, that is, as proceeding from the *formal* object of our assent or judgment. Now those objects are called *certain*, which of themselves are able, and doe beget a most constant and perfect certainty in our assents and judgments. As in natural things, those axiomes which Philosophers call *the first Principles*, to wit, *that a thing cannot both be and not be at the same time according to the same consideration*, *that a part of any thing cannot be so great as the whole thing*: And as in supernatural things, all truths revealed by Almighty God. This certainty is a certainty of faith considered in it self, that is, such an one as is naturally in divine faith, when it is truly framed and right disposed. As if we should say, Whatever God saith is true; for upon this ground the certainty of divine faith is most evident according to its own nature. And therefore to whomsoever it is infallibly manifest that God hath said such and such a thing, it were impossible he should not be certain of it; for there would follow a most clear and evident contradiction, if we should suppose God to have told an untruth. Wherefore a certainty proceeding from this principle, and built upon this ground, is of it self,
and

and of it's own nature, greater and perfecter then any other certainty whatsoever proceeding from humane and natural sciences. But of this more fully hereafter. Now I say, when the certainty of our assents, or truth of our judgments are supposed to proceed from these objects, they are said to be *formally* certain, by reason of the certainty of their objects. Yet this likewise is an unproper and equivocal name of *certainty*, which Divines call *formal*.

Thirdly, certainty or truth, which are properly so called, are in our understandings assent, by which we are said to believe or judge; and which is in our adhesion to the thing proposed. Yet that we may not seem to pass over any thing before we make it evident, it will be needful that we enquire and know more fully what this true and proper *certainty* is, or what is for a man to be *certain*.

The Philosophers and Divines of these later times, doe give a three fold denomination to *Certainty*. *Metaphysical*, *Physical* (in which they comprehend *Mathematical*) and *Moral*. Which terms, because they do not exactly discuss, and distinctly explicate, they make all things uncertain. It is manifest, that what degree soever of certainty is wanting in any of these (in the *moral* for example) which is in another (as in the *Physical* or *Metaphysical*) the same degree of doubtfulness must needs be in our assent thereunto. And therefore it is all one, for as much as belongs to the nature of a perfect and absolute certainty, how it is called, or in what subject it is. Wherefore

Intellectual,
and properly
so called.

Certainty hath
three denomi-
nations.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

fore this three-fold distinction of Certainty is only taken from the diversity of the subject wherein it may be found, and not from the quality of the assent : Nor whether it be in a *metaphysical*, *physical*, or *moral* subject, in what matter soever we consider it, unless it reach to the utmost pitch and height of certainty, we cannot properly say it is a perfect and compleat Certainty.

What is it to
be certain.

Wherefore leaving these ambiguous termes of the Schools, let us really enquire what we understand when we say, *we are certain of this or that*. And omitting all chimerical disputes in words, he that looks into the nature of men, shall find that 'tis nothing else but to have our mind, or understanding so firmly, constantly, and immoveably fixed in its adhesion to any subject whereof it judgeth, as that there remains no hesitation, no doubt, no wavering in his judgment, nor the least fear of being deceived : For as long as there remains the least apprehension in our understanding, that the thing may be otherwise then as we think, we cannot but have the same degree of doubtfulness, nor consequently can be truly said to be absolutely certain.

Some admit
no certainty.

Some there be who have banished all *Science*, especially *moral*, and consequently all perfect and absolute certainty out of their Schooles. Nor will they admit any other then what is demonstrated of material and corporeal subjects, as *Mathematical*, and *Geometrical*, which are palpable and discernable by our senses. As though it were credible that *good and evil*, virtue and vice, which are the immediate end of all created things, and
by

by which Divine providence hath ordained that all our felicity, or misery, both of this life, and of our future eternity, is to be regulated, should depend and be grounded upon unknown and uncertain foundations: or that the principles of all intellectual, sensible, vegital, and inanimate nature, should be wholly uncertain, and altogether unscrutable to the understanding of man, for whom they were created. But these are not questions for this place.

It is sufficient for the present, that we suppose the Divine Wisedome hath given us such a certainty, especially in the knowledge of those truths which doe necessarily belong to the salvation of mankind, as is convenient for our nature, and which is fit and proportional to the government and direction of our lives in our Moral and Religious actions; whereof it were a crime to doubt, and whereof we shall speak more fully hereafter.

There is a certainty in matters of faith.

Hence we may gather the difference between *faith and opinion*: For although both of them be a judgment of the understanding, yet are their natures different. *Opinion* doth extend it self more diffusedly unto all sorts of objects whatsoever and howsoever they may come unto our knowledge. But *faith* or *belief* is only of such things as we hear and are reported, and which are otherwise unknown unto us. *Opinion* is a judgment which doth necessarily involve some kind of doubtfulness or fear, whether the contrary may not be true: Faith, though it be sometimes uncertain, yet doth not uncertainty essentially

The difference between faith and opinion.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

tially and necessarily belong unto it. For belief doth sometimes contain such an absolute and compleat certainty in it, that it doth not admit the least doubtfulness, nor the least apprehension of the thing being otherwise: And in this respect it doth excell opinion.

It were easie to produce an infinity of examples, even of humane faith, both of things passed and present, which we only know by relation. As that there was a Council of *Trent*, and there is a City called *Rome*, whereof though one should have no other knowledge then by report (as no man now living can have other of the first) yet were he to be esteemed void of common sense, even in every mans opinion, who should doubt either of the one or of the other.

The Second Lesson.

*Whence it is that Belief or Faith in general
doth take it's certainty.*

IT is sufficiently cleared by what we have already said, what *faith* or *belief* is, and what *certainty* is. And by the definition of faith it is manifest, that it's certainty, considered in it self, must needs be taken from the authority or testimony of the Reporter, as (according to the language of the Schooles) from it's formal object or motive.

It is likewise evident, that *faith comes by hearing*; for we hear one who tells us something which we believe: And consequently every assent of faith must necessarily have more or lesse certainty

Faith is built
upon authority.

certainty in it, by how-much the reporters authority doth appeare to the mind or judgment of the hearer, to be of more or lesse weight and credit. We are therefore to seek out, whence it is, that the reporters authority or testimony doth take it's force and credit in our minds.

There be two things which give credit and strength to every reporters testimony, his *faithfulness*, or, as we may call it, his *veracity*, and his knowledge of the thing which he relates. For it is evident, that every assent of faith hath that degree of certainty in it, which the believers opinion of the reporters truth and knowledge of what he relates doth give it. If the hearer doe esteem the reporter to be either of small credit, or little knowing in the thing which he relates, he will presently think there's little belief to be given to what he saith: But contrary-wise, if he undoubtedly judge the reporter to be very true and faithful in his relations, and to be very knowing in that which he reports, he will presently assent to, and believe with a full certainty what he relates.

The ground of this authority is two-fold.

It is requisite that we take notice here of the great weakness of man's understanding, and of his ardent inclination and cupidity to pleasures and delights, both sensual and spiritual, which hath a most powerful influence, not to say a violent transport, into our intellectual judgments. Of both which infirmities we are more then sufficiently assured by dayly experience. Who doth not know what a forcible influence the passionate desires of men have into the intellectual acts of their soules,

The certainty of our judgment concerning the fidelity and skill of the Author of our believe, floweth from two principles.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

both in judging and willing? whereby falshood under the colour of truth is too too often introduced into our unwary judgments, and thence vehemently desired & prosecuted. Since therefore the certainty of faith doth essentially depend of the opinion or judgment which the believer hath of the relators faithfulness and knowledge; and that this opinion or judgment depends likewise of the imbecillity of his understanding, and of the passionate cupidities of his mind, it is necessary that we enquire further, what disposition of mind is requisite to beget an absolute and perfect certainty in the assent of faith. For although all certainty doth proceed from, and is caused by the understanding, yet 'tis clear that different dispositions of the mind do necessarily beget different degrees of certainty.

The principle
from whence
our certainty
proceedeth is
twofold.

There be two causes which do produce certainty in man; or rather, there be two severall dispositions in our mind, which doe beget certainty. The first is, when our understanding, freed from all passion and cupidity, is convinced with manifest reasons and evident demonstrations, to assent to what is proposed. And this is chiefly concerning common and universall positions, though it be also in particulars by the often exercised operations of our external senses, which we shall have occasion to examine hereafter. Secondly, when our minds are prevented and pre-occupied with some passionate motion or affection, and thence our understandings so blinded, as that they take any flourishing sophism, or slight fallacy, for an evident demonstration. This second doth often

The Analafys of Divine Faith.

11

often happen divers wayes, and by divers means, as every one knows, who hath seriously reflected upon the nature and actions of men. All which several wayes of falling into this infirmity, are comprehended in this common notion (not to speak of the pure incapacity of some mens understandings) either in that there is in the mind a kind of hatred and aversion to the thing proposed, or to the proposer; or else, that there is an immoderate affection and love to one of them.

Either of these dispositions in the mind, doth naturally beget a certainty. For being (as we have said already) that certainty is nothing else but a firm, constant, and fixed adhesion of the mind to the subject whereof it judgeth, insomuch that there remains no doubt nor fear of being deceived: And that this kind of adhesion may be found not only in a mind convinced with right and evident reason, but also in a mind blinded with a passionate disposition of love or hatred, it follows, that an absolute and compleat certainty may proceed from either of these principles or causes. Nor will any man doubt, who shall have often observed and studied the moral actions of men, but that sometimes a greater fixedness and adhesion is to be seen in some believers assent, which is caused by the weakness of his understanding, or by some passionate disposition (whilst he remains in this temper) then in another believers assent caused by an evident conviction of a manifest demonstration; so that 'tis clear, that certainty, or an intellectual stability of an assent, not only of faith, but also of any other judgment,

From both principles proceedeth a full certainty.

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

may either flow from and depend of an understanding rightly informed, or blindly perswaded thereunto. Which adhesion, when it is in the right, we call it *Constancy*; if in the wrong, though not discerned, we call it *Wilfulness*.

It is one thing for our understanding to be true or truly informed; and another for it to be certain.

It is therefore quite a different thing for an assent of the understanding to be compleatly and absolutely *certain*, and for to be *true*; for the certainty of an intellectual assent consists only in the fixedness of its adhesion, but truth consists in the conformity of the assent with its object. Though a man should absolutely think, and without fear and doubt esteem himself to say the truth, yet doth not such a man always say the truth, though he doth not lye: But he that absolutely thinks, and without all fear & doubt doth esteem himself to be certain, he is certain. And the reason of this disparity, is, that truth hath a necessary and essential relation to the object out of the understanding; but certainty consists only in the internal disposition of the mind.

There's two kinds of certainty in man, the one true and rational, the other passionate and blind.

Now because the same degree of certainty may proceed from the two forementioned principles, or rather from the same principle diversly disposed, we will therefore distinguish them by several names. The one we will call a *true and rational* certainty, the other passionate and blind; Ever noting (as it is very requisite) that an assent proceeding from this blind and passionate disposition, is sometimes of as great, nay of a greater stability, fixedness, and certainty (whilst this disposition lasteth) then that, which proceedeth from the most evident demonstration that can be imagined.

The

The Third Lesson.

Of the wayes and meanes by which the authority or testimony of the reporter ought to come to the believers knowledge.

THat all belief doth generally come by hearing, is manifest of it self, and commonly acknowledged by all. And I find, that the testimony of the reporter may come by hearing to the believers knowledge two manner of waies. First, by the immediate hearing of the first reporter himself, upon whose testimony we believe the thing related. As when an honest and faithful man doth tell us any thing that he himself did, or that he knows of his own knowledge. Secondly, when the first reporters testimony doth come unto us by the mediation of a third person, or of some other motives and arguments which induce us to believe. As when we believe what is told us, or written unto us (for reading is a kind of hearing) by one who doth assure that he had it from a very good hand, that is, from a trusty and knowing man, who said he knew it of his own knowledge. Now all belief must necessarily come one of these two wayes.

The authority of the reporter may come two wayes to the believer.

Hence we may infer, that all belief which hath a true and rational certainty, must needs presuppose two things. First, that the reporters testimony, for whose sake we believe, be most certain and *infallible* of his own nature. Secondly, that the meanes by which the reporters testimony comes

The true certainty of faith supposeth two things.

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

comes to the believers knowledge, be likewise *unerrable*. For unless both these be manifest to the believers understanding, by most evident and convincing reasons, it is impossible that his assent should have a *true and rational certainty*. For example, if one should hear that the *Turk* had got a victory in *Persia*, if either the reporters testimony (which stands upon the opinion which the hearer hath of the reporters fidelity and knowledge of what he saith) be doubtful to the hearer; or that the hearer be uncertain whether he said it or no, it is impossible that such a believers assent should have a *true and rational certainty*. But of this point more hereafter.

The certainty of Faith is of an equal degree to the certainty of the knowledge which the believer hath of the infallibility of the meanes by which the thing he believeth comes to his hearing.

We may also further infer, that an assent of faith built upon never so *infallible* a testimony, cannot have a greater certainty, *true and rational*, then hath the believers knowledge of the *infallibility* of the meanes by which that testimony is conveyed unto him, or by which it is manifest unto him, that the thing related doth depend upon that testimony. For it is evident, that whatever cause of doubt the believer may have of the truth or security of the meanes by which the testimony (though never so *infallible* of it selfe) hath signified this or that unto him, the like doubt, and of the same degree, he must needs have of the truth of the thing related.

The resolution of Faith is two-fold.

Hence we may likewise infer, that *faith* in general may be resolved two manner of ways. The first *Analysis* of faith may be under the pure consideration of *faith*, insisting precisely in its formal notion. And it is manifest by what is said, that

faith

faith under this consideration, is to be resolved into the testimony upon which it doth immediately rely, of what quality soever that testimony be. But if we consider it further, and look into the ground and foundation upon which we build all our assents of faith, and the rational certainty we have of any testimony, we shall finde that we must resolve faith into the knowledge which the believer hath of the worth and value of the authority or testimony of the reporter, and of the means by which the testimony is conveyed unto him: So that, the first fundamental stone upon which the building of faith is grounded, is the believers knowledge of the value and worth of the testimony for whose sake he doth give his assent, and of the security of the means by which the same testimony is applyed and conveyed unto him. For we have already shewed that the testimony, which is the direct and formal motive of faith, hath no other worth or value, in order to the believer, then what the believers judgment and knowledge of the fidelity and skil of the reporter doth give unto it. And consequently, that the whole edifice of the assent of faith is built, as upon its first root and fundamentall stone, upon the believers judgment and knowledge of the testimony for which he assents unto what is related, and of the means by which it is conveyed unto him.

Of what nature the believers judgment & knowledge ought to be, both of the testimony of the reporter, and of the means by which that testimony comes unto him, so as that our assents of faith may have

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

have a *true and rational* certainty, we have already sufficiently declared.

The Second Chapter.

Of the nature of Divine Faith considered in general.

The First Lesson.

Of the certainty of Divine Faith.

WE will here suppose what is commonly discussed and proved by Divines, to wit, That a Divine or Supernatural Faith, is necessary to eternal salvation, according to the Apostle, saying, *Without faith it is impossible to please God.* We will now only treat of the certainty of Divine Faith.

Two opposite errors concerning the necessity of divine faith.
Lutherans.

Socinians.

I find in this subject two errors, and those opposite. Some, as the *Lutherans*, (whose licentious lives have given no occasion for others to believe they intended to be saved by their piety and godliness) say, that our justification and eternal salvation is to be obtained by faith *only*. Others, as the *Socinians*, on the contrary say, that of all those points which are called Articles of Faith, there is no absolute certainty; nor is it of any moment, say they, whether any of them be believed or no, so that our lives be directed and governed according to the light of reason and moral honesty. This error I ever esteemed to be the

the much more dangerous to Christian Religion, as striking at the very foundation of Christianity. But for the present we will suppose, as elsewhere demonstrated, the *necessity* of a supernatural Religion, and Divine Faith; and we will now only seek into the principles and reasons of its certainty.

Philosophers acknowledge, that all humane actions doe proceed from the command and order of the *Will*: And that the *Will*, being blind of it self, is enlightened, moved, and guided to that *good* which is proposed to it by the understanding. Whence it is, that according to the strength and force of this precedent knowledge or judgment (whether true in effect, or false, covered with the vail of truth) the *will* doth act. Inso-much that the *will* being moved and carried with a strong opinion and judgment of the understanding, doth act powerfully and strongly, and during that disposition of the understanding, the *will* doth constantly persevere in the prosecution of its proposed object. And contrarywise, if the opinion or judgment wherewith the *will* is enlightened and moved to prosecute her proposed *good*, be feeble and doubtful, the *will* doth as weakly and coldly endeavour to compass what is proposed unto her. The strength and vigour of this precedent knowledge or judgment, doth chiefly consist in its *certainty*; and this *certainty* hath its force and strength two manner of wayes, or from two principles which we have already explicated, that is, from the evidence either of sense and manifest demonstration of reason, or

The *Will* doth act in vertue of a precedent judgment.

The force of this judgment doth consist in its certainty.

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

from some passionate cupidity and irregular disposition of the sense or of the mind.

The quality of this judgment which doth move the will is threefold.

This precedent judgment doth comprehend three conditions in it. The first is the *good* of the object which is proposed. The second is the value and worth of the *good*. The third is the conveniency of the means by which this *good* is to be obtained. So that according to the certainty which the understanding hath of these three conditions, the more strong or weak is the endeavor of the *will*, to compass the good proposed.

An example of one doubting in a thing of humane faith.

For example, if any one should propose to a brave souldier, and tell him there is a magnanimous & Martial Prince in a forraign and far distant Nation, whereof he never heard before, living in perpetual warrs against his enemies, who hath vowed and promised in the word of a King to all the officers and valourous souldiers of his Armies, of what Nation or condition soever they be, that he will bestow upon them honours and wealth, titles and riches, with a just and liberal hand, according to every ones deserts; that he will afford every man all such means as shall be convenient and proportionate to the employments wherein they are to be engaged. If this Souldier, I say, should doubt of what is told him, as whether there be any such a Prince or no, whether he hath made any such promise, whether he will perform his promise, whether he will not impose such taxes and burdens upon them as they shall not be able to accomplish; and finally, whether his rewards be of that extraordinary price and value, as that it will be worth his labour to undertake

take such a toylsome journey, and to undergoe such great paines and dangers to obtain them: If this souldier, I say, should doubt of all this, who doth not see how unwilling he would be to undertake such an enterprise?

The like happens in Divine Faith; for if any should doubt whether there be a *God*, whether he hath promised to reward us with an eternity of blessings, whether he will perform his promise, whether he will furnish us with convenient means to attain thereunto; and whether his reward will be of that value as that it deserves to be purchased with so much paines and difficulty? This I say is evident, that every ones endeavour in this enterprise, will be in a degree of earnestness proportionate to the measure of his faith, and of the certainty which he hath of what is proposed. Insomuch, that whose opinion and judgment of these things is very doubtful and uncertain, and consequently his faith weak and feeble, it is manifest that his endeavours will be but cold and careless, especially if he foresee that that which is proposed, is not to be compassed but with extraordinary paines and labour. Wherefore, not only faith, but the certainty of faith, is altogether necessary to beget a strong resolution in a Christian, to make him lead a pious life, and worthy an eternity of blifs. Yea, it is farther evident, that faith is the first spring and root of all our actions which tend to our eternal salvation.

These very examples may be more fitly applied to our Christian Faith; for if we put the case, that one should doubt whether God was incar-

A like example of one doubting in divine Faith.

The like is shewed in Christian faith.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

Matth. 22.

nate, and became man for our sakes ; whether he was crucified and died for our redemption ; whether he hath instituted and left us any Sacraments or other supernatural helps to assist and direct us ; and in fine, whether all that is delivered and written of the person of Christ be true histories, or only flying rumors and uncertain tales : who doth not see, that such an one, doubting of the truth of our Christian Faith, will be no more moved nor stirred up (if his doubtfulness be great) to the *love of God and his neighbour (wherein depends the whole Law and Prophets)* in vertue of these motives, then if he had never heard of Christ ? But contrarywise, how much happier is his condition who doth most certainly believe all the Articles of our Christian Faith (of what quality soever his certainty be, which is all one forasmuch as concerns the effect that will follow) how much more advantageous, I say, is this believers condition, then his who doubts of all ? This believer being strengthened and provoked with so many motives of love and fear, as ought certainly to carry him more smoothly, yea and inflame him more vehemently both to undertake and perform whatever his belief doth undoubtedly tell him is necessary to obtain his End.

The Second Lesson.

Of divers points necessary to be noted, as requisite to the discussion of Divine Faith.

BEfore we come to discuss the particular considerations of Divine Faith, it seems requisite to note some special heads, which otherwise might interrupt the thread of our ensuing discourse.

Having already shewed, that the certainty of our assents of faith, whether it be *true and rational*, or *blind and passionate*, doth spring chiefly, or (as Divines call it) formally, from the authority or testimony of the reporter. And that this authority or testimony doth take its worth and value from the opinion or judgment which the believer hath of the fidelity and skill of the reporter, it follows manifestly, that whosoever doth undoubtedly judge that God hath said, or revealed anything, he must necessarily believe it with a most strong and certain assent; for it is not possible that any man should doubt either of the fidelity and veracity of God, or of his skill and knowledge of what he saith.

The authority of God is infallible.

Notwithstanding this truth, there be many who doe most certainly averre (but with a blind and passionate certainty) that God hath said and revealed this or that, which others doe as certainly deny, and sometimes with no better certainty then the former. And hence doe necessarily arise dissentions and disputes betwixt these

Whence proceeds the variety of belief amongst those who rely upon God's authority?

par.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

parties, whereof the one side must certainly be in an error : For although both parties doe acknowledge the authority and testimony of *God*, in whatsoever he saith or revealeth to be most *infallible*, and that both of them doe likewise challenge his testimony to be the main ground and formal motive of their faith ; yet because the meanes by which Gods testimony is conveyed unto them, is divers, their faith therefore is also different.

An example
of this truth.

For example, we have *Luther* saying and believing most certainly (though with a *blind and passionate certainty*) that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is *God in the bread*. And *Calvin* saying and believing, there is *nothing but bread*; and both of them, as they think and tell us, building their belief upon the testimony of *God*, signified in the Bible ; yet by reason the meanes (to wit, each one his private sense, and particular exposition of the Scripture) by which Gods authority is conveyed unto them, is fallible and subject to error ; therefore both of their assents of faith (however blindly and passionately certain) may be, and are in effect erroneous and untrue. Wherefore it is evident (as we have already said of faith considered in general) that it is not sufficient, to the end we have a *true and rational* certainty in our assents of Divine Faith, that one doe unadvisedly think, or slightly imagine, that his assent of faith doth rely upon Gods authority, but it is necessary that the meanes by which this authority is conveyed unto him, be *infallible and unerrable*.

Being

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

23

Being we say that all Divine Faith is *Supernatural*, it behoveth us to know what it is for a spiritual or mental act to be *supernatural*. And forasmuch as concerns our present purpose, it is sufficient to note, that every act produced by the understanding or will, is therefore commonly said to be *supernatural*, because it is an effect which doth exceed and surpass all the productive activity of pure nature. Insomuch, that it is not within the reach or possibility of any created power or faculty to produce such an act, without some super-added help and assistance, which nature cannot challenge as due unto it, or which is contained within the ordinary course of nature.

What it is for
an act to be
supernatural.

Now that there is something of this kind in every act of Divine Faith, is most evident; for we give our assents to certain Divine Mysteries, and heavenly secrets, as to that of the *Trinity*, of the *Incarnation*, and others: And we build these assents upon the authority of God revealing them unto us, so as Gods Divine Testimony doth concur to these our assents and acts of faith, as their formal cause. Now both these things are beyond and above the ordinary lawes and limits of nature; being it is impossible that any pure creature, though never so perfect, should by the onely strength of nature, either assent to these things, or come to the knowledge of them. Wherefore, all our acts of this quality may be rightly said to be *supernatural*; yet will I not determine any thing of the manner how our spiritual faculties doe operate as the efficient causes of these acts, to wit, whether these acts doe so exceed the highest

How an act of
divine faith is
supernatural.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

highest pitch of natures power, as that 'tis necessary there be superadded some *active* force to produce them, which neither is proportionate in the same kind to any created understanding, nor comprehended within the order of Gods common and general concurrence. Whatever, I say, the truth be concerning the necessity of this supernatural activity, concurring as an efficient cause (which some Divines do explicate by the terms of infusion or influence) it is most certain that God doth produce in every created action the first, the last, and every degree of *being*, both natural and supernatural. So that these acts whereof we speak, are truly *Divine* and *Supernatural*, both because they doe rely upon the *Divine* testimony of God as a revealer; as also because they are concerning such high mysteries and such Divine subjects, as doe surpass the whole order and supream degree of created nature.

Whether the
certainty of an
act of divine
faith be super-
natural?

Now because the *certainty* of these acts is by some called *supernatural*, as are the acts themselves, it is to be noted, that though these acts be truly *supernatural*, both by reason of their matter, and of their form, as is already shewed, yet their certainty is not alike: For although belief, precisely as belief, be resolved into authority, and therefore Divine belief into Divine authority, which of it self is apt to beget all possible certainty, yet because the certainty of our assents of faith, and even of our Divine Faith, doth in its substance essentially depend of the certainty and infallibility of the meanes by which the authority is conveyed to our understanding, it is impossible that

our

our faith should have a greater certainty then the certainty which that meanes can give it, which, as we shall hereafter shew, cannot be properly called *supernatural*. When therefore some Divines say that the certainty of Divine Faith is supernatural, and greater then any natural certainty, I conceive they are to be understood of the certainty of faith purely in relation to its subject and object, considered in themselves, which of their own nature are apt to beget a supernatural certainty, that is, as we said before, a greater and more perfect certainty then any subject or object of natural sciences.

Farther it is to be noted, that according to our two-fold distinction of certainty above explicated, both of belief considered in general, and of Divine belief, there be some who have a blind and passionate certainty of Divine Faith, grounded only upon their private and particular judgments: That is to say, the authority and testimony of God is onely conveyed and delivered unto them by the meanes of their own particular and private ratiocination. I doe not speak of those Catholicks who doe as strongly adhere to their sequels and consequences, deduced out of the principles and articles of faith by discourse, as if they had all possible certainty of them, and whereof some of them will boldly say they are to be believed as points of faith; of which we shall speak hereafter. But I speak onely of those; who because they find this or that place in the holy Scriptures (wherin they suppose there is Divine authority) which taking upon them to interpret

What kind of certainty of faith is that, which is grounded upon private and particular mens judgments.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

(having no other meanes whereby any Divine truth can be more certainly conveyed unto them) they thence draw, or rather extort, this or that sense, and cleave and adhere thereunto with as vehement a certainty (though *blind and passionate*) as if God himself had immediately taught them.

The certainty of faith grounded upon the instruction of our Pastors.

Others there be who assent unto all revealed truths with as great a certainty as the former (whose certainty is not alwayes compleatly perfect and *rational*) grounded upon the testimony of God conveyed and applyed unto them by the instruction and discipline of their Bishops and Pastors. And these, although sometimes they know not, or at least doe not perfectly comprehend, whether this meanes be *infallible*, nor consequently cannot evince the certainty of their faith by any evident demonstration (whether this proceed from the natural imbecillity and weakness of their understandings, or from some passionate and perverse disposition of their mind) yet whilst they doe most certainly adhere to that divine faith, which they receive by the meanes of the Teaching and Preaching of their Pastors, it is manifest that their faith is most secure, and that they are safe in matters of belief, so they be members of that Society or Church which doth hold and teach all revealed truths, and whereof the *Pastors and Rectors* have a *true and rational* certainty of the *infallibility* of the means by which this Divine doctrine is conveyed unto them.

That it is a great grace to be a member of the Church.

What a grace and blessing it is to be born or become a member of this Society (if it doe once appear

appear that there is such a society upon earth, which we shall demonstrate hereafter) no man can doubt; for this must needs be a special effect, either of such a mans predestination, or at least of Gods particular providence towards him, being that it is to be esteemed an extraordinary favour and benefit, which we see is denied to so many thousands. How many Martyrs of Christ have we had in the Primitive Church, who insisting in this certainty, have suffered death for the truth of their faith? How many poor and unlearned men? How many young and timorous women? who could not (perhaps) evince the truth of their believe by manifest arguments, yet strongly adhering to the Doctrine of the *Pastors and Bishops of their souls*, in testimony of their certainty in matters of belief, have undergone all sorts of torments.

1 Pet. 2.

Moreover it is to be noted, that we do not here enquire whether Christian Religion be true or no, but we suppose it to be true, and elsewhere demonstrated. The main and onely difficulty we now discuss, is, by what means we may certainly know which is revealed and Christian Doctrine. Nor can we doubt but that man (who by his natural and essential constitution is a reasonable creature) ought to comprehend by discourse and ratiocination, that it is most reasonable for him to assent unto those things which are revealed, and which are certainly proposed unto them to be believed by Divine Faith. And it is farther manifest, that the Author of nature, being also the Author of grace, it was fit, that

We ought to finde out by discourse what is to be believed with Divine faith.

All revealed things are consonant to reason, though contrary to sense.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

what he would super-adde, exceeding the whole course of nature for mans greater perfection, it was fit, I say, that such things should be convenient and proportionate unto mans nature : For though opposite and contrary to the inferiour and sensible portion of man, yet no wayes opposite, but congruous and conformable to his rational soul.

Revealed
things must
come unto
the soul by
the senses.

Lastly, we must suppose, that being our assent of faith is an act of our understanding, and that nothing is to our understanding, which hath not in some sort first been in our senses, it must needs follow that the certainty of our assents of faith is grounded in the certainty of our senses; that is, its first root and origen is from our senses. For whatsoever the means may be (which we are now seeking out) by which all revealed doctrine is to be applyed and delivered unto us, it is evident that such a means cannot be manifest to the whole society of Christian mankind, unlesse it be first most apparent and clear to our senses. And therefore it is rightly said, *Faith comes by hearing.*

Rom. 10.

The Third Chapter.

*Of the means by which all revealed Doctrine
is to be known.*

The First Lesson.

The state of the Question is proposed, and of what nature and quality this means ought to be, is explained.

BEING the revealed principles of Christian Religion doe surpass and exceed all humane reason, it is not to be imagined that they can be found out by any industry or labour of mans wit, but are to be supposed by all Christians. We are therefore to enquire of whom the Divine and hidden secrets are to be learned, without danger of being led amisse. Who are the unerrable proposers of these divine truths. By what square or rule we may certainly know them. Or in a word, what is the means by which the whole society of Christians may *infallibly* come to the knowledge of this divine and Christian doctrine.

The certainty of faith cannot be greater then the certainty of the means:

First, it seems needles to prove by reason and arguments that which of it selfe, and at the first sight is evident to every man of common sense; to wit, that it is impossible, that any mans assent of faith, no not even of Divine faith, should have a greater *true and rationall* certainty, then hath the same

same mans assent unto the means, by which the object of his faith is applied and conveyed unto his understanding. For what certainty soever we can ascribe and attribute unto any intellectual assent built upon the authority of God revealing something unto us, that certainly must necessarily proceed and depend of the certainty of the means by which Gods authority is conveyed unto the understanding. For as it is impossible that any one should believe or assent unto any thing, because God hath revealed it, unlesse he conceive and think that God hath revealed it: So it is likewise impossible that any one should believe with a greater *true and rationally* certainty those things which are said to be revealed by God, then is the certainty wherewith he knows that God did reveale them. For what ever degree of uncertainty and doubtfulnesse is in the mind and knowledge of the believer, concerning the certainty of the means, the self-same degree of uncertainty and doubtfulnesse must necessarily be in his assent or believe of those things which are proposed by that means. Wherefore, by how much more or lesse any believer shall doubt, whether God did reveale this or that, by so much he must necessarily doubt of the thing it self, which God is said to have revealed. For what man in his right senses, will not easily perceive that no man can be *truly and rationally* more certain of any thing which God is said to have revealed, then he is certain that God hath revealed it. If therefore the means whereby any revealed thing is applied and conveyed to the believer, be in any sort fallible

fallible and subject unto error, it is evident that the thing revealed must be likewise uncertain and fallible in relation to the same believer. For example, what wise man can say that he is more certain of the Noble and generous exploits done by *Cesar*, or that such and such Laws were instituted by *Justinian*, then he is that there was a *Cesar* or a *Justinian*. Or, in our subject; that these and these mysteries were revealed and taught by *Christ*, then that there was a *Christ*. I should truly have passed over this in silence, but that some late Divines, who slightly and problematically disputing all things, and particularly treating of the nature of faith with a shallow and weak discourse, have framed in their heads I know not what kind of Divine & supernaturall certainty in Christian belief (passing by the true and rationall one) and thence are forced to maintain that there is a greater certainty in their beliefe of Christian doctrine, then there is in their belief that *Christ* either ever was, or ever taught it. Which how incredible it is, I leave it to the judgment of common sense. These Divines doe imagine, that this certainty of theirs, doth flow and proceed from a particular instinct of the Holy Ghost, or internall motion of the grace of God, given to all Christians, whereby they doe assent unto, and believe all Divine and revealed truths. Into this particular and private inspiration from God, given distinctly to every singular Christian believer, they conceive this certainty is to be resolved. And from this onely principle they derive that certainty which they call *supernaturall and Divine*. I have often wondred to

An Example of this truth.

The opinion of some Divines.

This opinion doth not differ from those who rely upon the private spirit.

finde

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

finde this opinioſion ſo common, which I could never by any means diſtinguiſh from the frivolous and fictitious invention of thoſe who boaſt themſelves to be inſpired with the private ſpirit (which I ſhall hereafter confute and explode) being all the arguments and reaſons which confound the one, doe equally fight againſt the other.

I doe not deny but that a particular inſpiration, and ſpecial concurrence of Divine grace is altogether neceſſary, even in the quality of an efficient cauſe, to every individual perſon, to the end that he may aſſent unto and believe all Divine truths. But to ground the certainty and *infallibility* of our Catholick faith upon this ſupernaturall, internall, and inviſible motion or influence, and to derive its laſt reſolution into ſuch a ſingular inſtinct, ſeems to me moſt abſurd and ridiculous. I would gladly know what certain ſign, or undoubted mark they have of this their private inſpiration. How ſhall any man be ſecured, without fear of error, that he is moved with this divine and ſupernatural inſtinct? By what token is this internall and ſpirituell motion of grace to be diſcovered? what true and evident argument can any man bring, that either he himſelf, or any other hath this holy and heavenly inſpiration? Laſtly, amongſt many who believe moſt oppoſite and contrary tenets, who all pretend to this private ſpirit, how ſhall we know who is in the right, who is in the wrong? truth from error?

I confeſſe, that whereas ſome, at the preaching of the Goſpel, doe believe; others, to whom the ſame truth, and in the ſame circumſtances is alſo preached,

preached, not believing; I confesse, I say, that a speciall degree of Gods grace is given to those, which these have not. But to imagine that the *infallibility* of the Catholick faith belonging to all Christians in generall, is to be referred and resolved into this singular, internal, invisible, and spiritual suggestion of grace, seems to me a most foolish imagination, and ridiculous error; for though we suppose that some such ones private and particular faith were evident to him that should preach it unto us, as it was in the Prophets, Apostles, and others, who have had real and true revelations, what were this to those to whom this evidence doth not appear? for it is manifest, that this particular rule, which is proper to every individual person, cannot be a publick and common rule unto all, which is a quality necessarily requisite to the rule of our Catholick faith.

Whether some speciall inspiration and illumination from God may not beget a perfect certainty in him to whom it is given, we shall examine hereafter. In the interim it is evident, that it behoves all Christians to find out some other pillar then this, whereupon to fix the certainty of the Catholick faith, considered in general, & as it ought to be common to all. Wherefore the main difficulty in this question, and indeed of all controversies in Religion (for it is the greatest, if not the onely subject worthy dispute) consists in this point: what is the means by which Christs revealed doctrine is to be communicated, and conveyed to all Christians, or by which all Christians, even to a man, may most certainly and without danger of error,

The state of
the question.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

come to know what Christ hath revealed and instituted. All Christians doe acknowledge, that there was a Christ, and that he revealed, taught & instituted many things to be believed and practised; but to shew the means by which all these things may be certainly known, especially to perverse and wilfull men, there's the great difficulty.

Nor doe we here seek the certainty of a means considered in it selfe, such as may be the Scripture or Word of God, but with relation to us, that is, whose nature it is, to take away all occasion of doubt, and diversity of beliefe from us, and from all the members of the whole universall Church, being the revealed truths and Divine tenets of our Christian Religion, ought to be the self same, publick, and common to all.

The means by which revealed things are to be known ought to have two qualities.

Rom. 10.

Now in as much as we are all *Men*, that is, sensible and rationall creatures, all things that are to be communicated to our minds, must be conveyed unto us, for the most part, by our externall senses, wherefore I still say with the Apostle, *faith comes by hearing*. Whence it is, that the means which we seek after, must have two conditions: The first, that it must be so notorious and evident to our external senses, that it shall be impossible for any Christian to be ignorant of its *being* or *existing*; that is, that they cannot doubt but that there is such a thing. The second, that it must be apt and able of its own nature, to beget a most true and rationall certainty in all men whatsoever (so they have the use of reason, and be but indifferently free from the excesse of passion,) who shall come to the knowledge of it. If we can finde a
means

a meanes of this nature, it will be evident that such a meanes will be most fit and convenient to deliver and convey from hand to hand the revealed truths whereof we speak; for in vertue of its first quality or condition, it will be eminent in the eye of every Christian, and, *like a City placed upon a hill, or a Candle in a candlestick.* And in vertue of the second condition, it will be a *safe guide; the Kings high-way; and a pillar or ground of truth:* So that whosoever shall receive and hold all his revealed Doctrine and Tenets by such a meanes, he both may and ought give such an assent unto them, as will have a most secure, true, and rational certainty in it. But, that we may not let any thing pass that seemes to be obscure, we are to note, that a *thing* or *object* may be so notorious & known unto us by our external senses, and consequently so certain, even with a *true and rational* certainty, that he were to be thought void of common sense, who should have the least doubt of it. Let us put an example even in the matter which we treat of: Suppose the *Scripture* were this meanes which we seek after (whereunto nevertheless we shall in the ensuing discourse demonstrate, that the second condition which we require cannot belong.) It is so notorious by our external senses to the whole Christian world, that there is a book which we commonly call the *Scripture*, or the *Bible*, that he would be deservedly thought to be mad, who should make the least scruple or difficulty to believe it. For it were impossible that any one should believe or assent unto those revealed truths which he conceives

Mat. 5.

Num. 21.

1 Tim. 3.

An object may be certainly known by our external senses.

An example of this truth.

Another example of the same.

to be in the holy *Bible*, unless he were first most certainly assured by his eyes, his eares, and other senses, that there were a *Bible*. But let us put another example, whereof we shall have occasion to speak more amply hereafter. Suppose this meanes were the universal teaching and practise of the Pastors, Priests, and Lay-Christians of the whole Catholick Church. This is a thing so manifest to our external senses, to wit, that there is, or doth exist through the whole Christian world, Bishops, Pastors, Priests, and Lay-Christians, whereof some do teach the Mass (for example) to be a sacrifice instituted by Christ (and the like may be said of the rest of the Articles of our faith, whatever the truth be, whereof we shall speak hereafter) others doe dayly celebrate, and offer the sacrifice of the Mass; others are present at this sacrifice, and do assist and accompany the Priests with their prayers and adorations. That this, I say, *is*, and is done, is so evident to our external senses (whether well, or no, we shall see hereafter) that no Christian in his right wits can doubt of it.

The manner how the certainty of our senses is effected.

This certainty, which is had by our external senses, though it cannot be properly called *Evidence*, yet doth it beget a no lesse constant, strong, and fixed adhesion in mens minds, who have the right use of reason, and are not perversly resolved to acknowldge no truth at all, then doth the manifest demonstration clearly deduced out of evident principles. The way and manner how this certainty is begot in our minds, is this. Let us suppose any thing testified upon this ground, that

that in some one sensible object (to wit, in Christ conversing with the Apostles, preaching and working of miracles) every one of his auditors senses doth perceive his proper and peculiar object, the eye his colour, the ear his voice, and so of the rest: Let their operations be often reiterated in several postures and dispositions; may let these sensible acts be a hundred and a thousand times reiterated in divers, but still proportionate circumstances: And farther, let this be confirmed by the testimony of many dis-interested men, who doe likewise perceive the same objects with their senses, insomuch that these operations of their senses doe extend themselves to an ample kind of universality and variety (which, by how much more they are universally extended, by so much more certain are the truths testified by them) I mean to an universal extent, in relation to times, to place, to the reiteration of the acts, to the variety of circumstances, to the number of witnesses, and the like. Now I say from this universal testimony of our external senses, such a certainty may spring and arise to that height, as that no mathematical demonstration shall be able to beget a greater, no nor perhaps an equal. But to what precise degree of universality these operations of our senses ought to arise, to the end they may beget and settle an absolute and perfect certainty in our minds, neither is it needfull to enquire, nor can I easily determine it.

Here we may note by the way, that the operation of one only sense, of the hearing, for example, and that practised by one only person, may
ground

The operation
of one only
sense may be-
get a certainty.

An example
of this truth.

ground an assent so secure and certain, and that with a *true and rational* certainty, yea and of an absent object, and otherwise wholly unknown unto the party, as that he were to be neglected as foolish, who should any way doubt of it. This we did suppose, *Cap. 1, Less. 3.* where we shewed that to the true and rational certainty of an assent of faith is required, that the testimony of the reporter be *infallible*, and that the meanes by which the testimony is to come to the believers knowledge be likewise *unerrable*; which we may illustrate by this example. He that never saw *Rome*, nor hath any other ground to believe that there is a City so called but by hearing, may not the certainty of such a mans assent thereunto, though only grounded upon his hearing, be most strong, fixed, and constant? Sure it may: And the reason is, because the operation of this only sense in relation to this object, so often and in such different and due circumstances repeated, cannot but make the hearer certain of this, that he hath heard it said, I say, so certain, that he must be stupid beyond measure, if he should doubt whether he had heard it or no; which afterwards coming to discuss by ratiocination, he will easily demonstrate with most evident and convincing arguments, that it is impossible so many several men, without any pre-occupation or prevention, without any intelligence one with another, and without any interest in the business, should all of them conspire to tell and publish such a notorious lye. But of this point we shall speak more fully hereafter, when we come to treat of universal tradition, and General

ral Councils. In the interim it is evident, that the operation of one onely sense duely exercised, though by one only person, may rightly and most certainly ground an assent of faith, free from all danger of error.

Let us therefore now settle this truth as most evident, and never hereafter to be called in question, that we may be so manifestly certain, with a *true and rational* certainty, by the means of our external senses of divers particular truths, especially when they are universally acknowledged, that this very certainty is the ground and foundation of the whole course of mans actions and humane society.

Certainty may be had of particulars.

Let us likewise settle (which we shall more exactly shew in the ensuing discourse) that the meanes by which all revealed doctrine is, for the most part, to be communicated and conveyed to the society of Christians, ought to be of that nature and condition that it must be extream easie to perceive it by our external senses, yea and so evidently apparent, that there should be no doubt in any man, but that it *is*, or doth *exist*; for the facility of coming to the hearing and knowing of Christian Doctrine (which must proceed from the evidence of this means) ought to be so great, that no man should be debarred from it through any humane infirmity or weakness, that there should be none so silly but might find it out readily and infallibly. In a word, this means ought to be obvious even to every child, old wife, and countrey peasant.

The meanes which is to convey and communicate revealed things ought to be most notorious to our senses.

Concerning the second quality or condition

of

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

It ought likewise make all men certain of the revelation.

No sort of men are excluded from salvation.

There be certain extraordinary wayes by which God sometimes doth reveal his secrets.

of this meanes whereof we treat, to wit, that of its own nature it ought to be fit and able to make all the members of the Christian Society, of what capacity or quality soever they be, altogether certain of every thing that Christ hath revealed, whether of belief or practise; that this meanes, I say, ought to have this quality, is most evident. First, because our assents of faith ought not to be wavering, inconstant, and uncertain, but fixed and settled, as we have already shewed. Besides, this meanes ought to produce a stability and certainty of faith, not only in some few learned men, or excellent wits; no nor only in those who live in a high degree of piety and godliness, but even in all men whatsoever, so they but have the use of common sense and reason, and are born capable of that eternal blis which is to be obtained by faith. Christ Jesus having excluded no sort of men, neither from the participation and communion of his doctrine and discipline, nor from the right way to eternal salvation, much lesse hath Gods goodness and divine wisdom rejected any, by reason of their deficiency in some natural gifts and perfections, whereof he himself is in some sort Author.

This means, I say, ought most certainly to have these two conditions, being there is no other ordinary way by which all revealed truths and tenets are communicated unto us. Although sometimes (though but seldome) Gods divine goodness doth vouchsafe to supply both these conditions towards some particular persons, and in some particular points, with such special beams

of

beames of his grace, as he thinks fit, whereof we shall speak in its proper place. We now onely treat of and determine the nature and condition of this meanes, in relation of the common and ordinary way of communicating revealed tenets to all Christians in general, omitting those unaccustomed and extraordinary wayes and meanes, which doe exceed the common and ordinary course of Gods providence. For I do not deny but that God doth sometimes shew and manifest his omnipotent and absolute power by some external and visible works above the ordinary course of natural causes. Nor will such meanes as may perhaps be sufficient to bring some particular and special men to the knowledge of revealed truths suffice our turn, because we must have such a meanes as will produce the same effect of certainty to the whole body and society of Christians. For though we suppose there were a means which of it self were apt enough, and able to beget a *true and rational* certainty in the assents of faith, in relation to some few mens understandings; yet being the judgments and opinions of some particular men in things not immediately and evidently clear to the external senses, are ordinarily subject to error, and often false (as I shall shew anon) it is no way fit that our Divine Faith (which ought to be as certain as any thing can be) in as much as it is common to all Christians, should relye upon so weak and frail a foundation.

Moreover, that this meanes ought to be apt and able of its own nature to convey all revealed

It was necessary that Christ should provide such a meanes to his Church.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

ed tenets, *certainly and infallibly*, to the whole society of Christians, is most evident, if we consider the worth and dignity of Christ's person. For if we suppose him to be truly *God and Man*, we must needs likewise confesse that he hath instituted a meanes of such a nature and condition, as may and will most *unerrably* convey and communicate to posterity, that is, to his disciples in after-ages, of what quality soever, all those things which he hath revealed and taught as necessary to salvation. For seeing that Christ did onely reveal immediately to his Apostles and others of his time the mysteries of our faith and divine articles of belief and practise, and yet would have his doctrine to descend whole and entire with an undiscontinued succession from age to age to the end of the world, and this to the whole society of his succeeding disciples, it is manifest that it was altogether necessary for him to institute and provide a meanes of the nature and condition which we have declared. For if he had not constituted such a meanes as might have certainly notified all such revealed tenets as are universally necessary to the whole society of Christians, he had left us *like children to be tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive, &c.* And what rule or meanes soever doth naturally induce and beget differences and contentions in relation to the same end, such a rule is unfit, vain, of no use and indeed no rule at all.

Nor can any man in reason reply, and say, that
Christ

Christ onely intending to fave some few (*his elect.*) It was fufficient that he provided a meanes by which they might come to know *infallibly* what they were to believe and practice. And for the reft, it imported not whether they had any meanes whereby they might come to know it or no. This, I fay, is a very irrational evasion: For firft it was requisite and neceffary that there fhould be a meanes, even for the reprobate, whereby they might come to the knowledge of Christs divine doctrine, and confequently neglecting to feek it, might be defervedly damned. For though in a Kingdome or Commonwealth there were some men, who either by a fpecial favour from their Prince, or by their own understanding and induftry, fhould come to know the Lawes of their Nation; yet unlefs there were a meanes ordained, whereby the whole body of the Kingdom, or fociety of the Commonwealth, might come to know their Lawes, it could neither be faid, that the Supreme and Legislative power had fufficiently provided to have their Lawes known, much lefs to have them obferved; nor that the ignorant transgreffors could be defervedly & juftly punifhed. Secondly, we fhall evidently fhew hereafter, that the fame means which would be fafe and convenient for all the Elect, would be alfo common to the Reprobate.

All we Christians doe profefle that Jefus Christ hath instituted a new Law, a Gospel of grace; and that he hath declared it to be the onely neceffary way, and the perfect way to falvation; that he would have all his difciples after his death

Christ having instituted a new law, was obliged to provide a means whereby it might be known.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

to walk according to that holy path, yea and to perform, under pain of eternal damnation, both in faith and works, the precepts and commandments of this his sacred doctrine and discipline. It was sure therefore necessary that he should provide such a meanes as we have declared, whereby all that he ordained as necessary to salvation, might be *infallibly* delivered and conveyed from age to age, and from father to son, with a perpetual and uninterrupted succession, to the whole society of those that should believe in him. For being he knew full well (as it is most evident) that it would be altogether impossible for the professors of his name, after two or three ages, to know undoubtedly, without such a means as we speak of, all those things which he had revealed and commanded (much lesse to believe and observe what they had no certain and undoubted knowledge of) it was necessary, I say, that he should institute such a meanes, unlesse he would deservedly incur the censure (be it spoken without offence) either of extraordinary indiscretion, or unheard-of malice. For to believe that he would institute a Law, that he would proclame the observance of it to be necessary to salvation, that he would take extream paines and labour to divulge it ; yea sign and seal it with his precious blood, and with the bitter pangs of a most cruel and ignominious death, promising in fine, that it should last to the end of the world. And after all this, to provide no meanes whereby this new Law and Gospel might be certainly known to his posterity, were in effect to accuse him, either of a
very

very foolish and ridiculous enterprise, or of an odious malignity and perverse hatred to the whole body of mankind. For in this case it must needs follow, that either he intended out of a malicious & mischievous wilfulnesse to condemn the greatest part of mankind, yea even of Christians, to the bottomlesse pit of hell, not giving them any certain meanes whereby to know the true way to salvation, which he himself had taught, which is a thing unworthy, and impossible that a *Supream goodness* should doe; or it was not in his power to invent such a certain and secure means as might be common and convenient to all succeeding Christians, which is a thing intollerable and wicked for any man to imagine of the *Supreme Wisedome*. Wherefore since he could doe it out of his infinite wisedome, and would do it out of his his infinite goodnesse, it is most certain that he hath done it. From what we have said, we may draw this conclusion, That being Divine Faith doth necessarily rely upon Divine Revelation, if there be any doubt of the revelation, there will be no less doubt of the thing revealed. Whence it follows, that we must needs find out a meanes whereby those things which we are bound to believe as of Divine faith, may most certainly appear unto us to be truly revealed. This means ought likewise to be evident and perspicuous to all Christians, and of its own nature ought to be fit and able to bring them most securely unto the knowledge of what is revealed, without danger of being led into error. Wherefore it resteth only to finde out this meanes. But first it seemes requisite to note divers things concerning

The conclusion
of the argu-
ment.

ning the matters or subjects which are revealed.

The Fourth Chapter.

Of those things which are revealed, considered in general.

The First Lesson,

Of the several kinds of Christian truths, considered in general.

HAVING declared in the precedent Chapter the common disposition and nature of the *means* by which revealed things are to be known, before we descend to discuss & discover what this means may be in particular, it seems requisite that we briefly say something of the nature and condition of those things which are revealed, considering them in general. And that we may succinctly treat of this subject with method and order, we will divide all Christian truths that is, all truths directly belonging to Christian Religion, whether they consist only in the assent of our understanding, or in some external act of Divine cult and worship (which Divines call speculative and practical) into four Heads or Classes.

Christian truths may be divided into four Classes.

Revealed truths of the first Classe.

In the first Classe we will put all Divine and Catholick truths, which doe immediately rely upon Divine revelation or institution, and which

which have defcended by univerfal tradition from age to age in an undiscontinued fucceffion, and fo came to the knowledge of the prefent Church, or fociety of Chriftians, in relation to what time or age foever we compare it. Of this kind are all our Articles of faith, that is, which are truly and univerfally acknowledged by all Catholicks to be Articles of faith, whether they confift in the fole affent of our understanding, or in fome external act of divine worfhip.

In the fecond order we wil put fuch truths as we may call purely *Catholick*, to wit, which have been always undoubtedly received by the full confent of the univerfal Church; and which, although they be not properly Divine nor revealed truths, yet doe they rely, and are ftrongly built upon univerfal tradition. Of this kind are all the truths which are related in the holy Scripture by the way of hiftory, that is, thofe which doe contain any matter of fact, wherein there is nothing either of Divine Inftitution, or of the Churches practice ordained by Chrift's exprefs commandement. Into this order likewife we may put that main and important truth univerfally acknowledged, to wit, that the *Scripture is the Word of God*. There be alfo fome other truths which may be put into this Claffe, though they be of an inferiour condition, becaufe they are not contained in the Scripture, whereof fome confift meerly in the internal affent of our understanding, as that *St. Peter* was at *Rome*. Others confift in fome practice, or external action, as that *Lent* was inftituted by the Apoftles,

Catholick
truths of the
fecond Claffe.

Canonical
truths of the
third Classe.

In the third order we will put those truths which we may properly call meerly *Canonical*, to wit, which doe serve the Church for a rule or Canon, and whereunto some sort of obedience is due. Of this kind we have many things defined by General Councils and Popes, which the universal Church doth not acknowledge to have received immediately and expressly either by Divine revelation, or universal tradition. For General Councils, and sometimes the Pope, cannot onely declare and pronounce against hereticks and schismaticks, such things as are divinely revealed and instituted, and which they certainly know to have been infallibly conveyed by universal tradition; but can also in some sort define and determine such things as may be necessary to take up dissentions and quarrels in the Church amongst Catholicks themselves, and which may concern the general good of Christians. Of this nature we finde divers things both in the Decrees of General Councils, and in the Bulls and Constitutions of Popes; and these not onely in things belonging to the Churches discipline and practise, but also in such things as doe consist onely in the internal assent of our understanding. Now of what nature & certainty these definitions and decrees be, we shal declare in their proper place.

Theological
truths of the
fourth classe.

In the fourth and last order we will put all Theological truths, which in these our times, wherein all things are sceptically and problematically disputed, are but very few universally acknowledged, or manifestly deduced by evident
con-

consequences out of the principles of faith, and out of those truths which we have put into the first and second order.

All the truths of the first order are to be believed with Divine Faith, that is to say, they are truly and properly Articles of our Catholick faith. And being every assent of Divine Faith doth rely upon Divine revelation, as upon its formal and essential object, it follows that whatsoever is not truly and properly revealed by Almighty God, is not, properly and strictly speaking, an Article of Divine faith.

The truths of the first classe are articles of faith.

Two things therefore are required, that any Christian truth be an Article of Faith. First, that the thing it self be revealed by God Almighty, and that it be received, and acknowledged for revealed, by the whole Church. Secondly, that it have descended by universal tradition, with an undiscontinued succession from age to age, and thus delivered to the whole Church, as a thing or doctrine revealed. Wherefore, that any tenet or truth be an Article of our Divine and Catholick faith, it is not sufficient that it be onely a thing revealed; or that it be onely a thing delivered by universal tradition; but it is necessary that it have both these conditions, as we shall more fully shew hereafter. Whence it is manifest, that the Articles of our Divine and Catholick faith are much fewer in number then Divines doe commonly imagine them to be. The Christian truths of the second order, cannot be properly said to be revealed, nor consequently that they are, speaking properly,

Two things required to an article of faith.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

ly, Articles of our Divine faith, according to the rule and reason we have so often given. These truths are *Catholike* and certain, and all Christians are bound to maintain them; yet, because they are not revealed, they cannot immediatly ground an assent of Divine Faith.

The truths of the second classe are in some sort the ground of the truths of the first classe.

Some of these truths are in some sort the ground of all revealed truths, principally this; that *the holy Scripture is the Word of God*: As also all those things which are historically written in the New Testament of our Saviours life, from the first moment of his blessed conception, until the last period of his precious death, whereon our Christian faith is mainly grounded. And although divers things set down therein are no mysteries, nor revealed dogmes, nor any thing of divine institution, but onely a relation of Christs, or his disciples humane actions, performed after the manner of other men; yet, were it lawful to call them in doubt, our Christian faith would quickly perish. And all these things stand upon no other ground then universal tradition. Let Catholicks therefore consider, as well as Hereticks, how much it concerns them and all Christians, to establish and settle the evident certainty, and manifest *infallibility* of universal tradition. These things are of divers sorts. Some things there be in holy Scripture, even in expresse words, which doe belong to matters of Doctrine, or which have a near and immediate relation to the truths of the first order, to wit, our christian mysteries, and revealed tenets, as Christ being born, and his suffering, which must needs

Of these truth contained in the Scripture there be two sorts.

needs be pre-supposed to the belief of Christ's doctrine. Several other things there be of the same nature, which doe commonly occur in the Scripture. Other things there be which are purely historical, and do no way belong to our christian doctrine, but are as it were accidentally inserted into the Scripture, as that *St. Paul left his cloak at Troas*, and divers other things of this nature, which doe no way belong to our Divine faith, or Christian doctrine. Those of the first sort doe rely directly upon universal tradition, having been alwayes, and with an uninterrupted succession from age to age believed by the universal Church, and wherewith the people have been ever imbued, as with tenets most necessarily belonging to our christian faith and religion. But these of the second sort, however most true, doe not directly rely upon universal tradition, but onely as it were implicitly, that is, in as much as they are contained in the holy Scripture, which doth rely upon universal tradition.

There be other christian truths which may be reduced to this order, not because we find them in the holy Scripture, nor yet that they doe so properly rely upon universal tradition; I mean the Catholick Church doth not assent unto them in the vertue of universal tradition, as immediately belonging to our christian faith and religion, in the same manner as she doth adhere to the former truths, but onely as delivered by a tradition purely historical. For xample, That *St. Peter* was at *Rome*: That *Lent* was instituted by the Apostles, and the like. For although the tradi-

There be other christian truths which are not contained in the Scripture.

tion of these tenets be in some sort universal, yet it is of another nature and quality then is the universal tradition of our Articles of faith, which we shall declare more fully when we shall discuss the nature and condition of universal tradition.

The truths of
the third classe
are of another
nature.

The truths of the third order neither have that certainty which the revealed Articles of our faith have, nor which our Catholick tenets have universally delivered and believed; but *that* only which the authority and jurisdiction of the Superiors and Rectors of the Catholick Church can give them. For being the duty of Preaching, Teaching, and governing the Church, doth belong to these Superiors, it is needful that they have all the power which may be requisite to its conservation. Wherefore it is necessary, that the Governors of the Church have power, every one within his Precincts, to determine all quarrels of moment, which seem to tend, either to the total ruine, or to the notable damage of the Church. And of this nature we have divers things defined and decreed by the Church. As in the Council of *Basle*, where the question about our Blessed Ladies immaculate conception was in some sort defined; which we all know was never expressly revealed, nor expressly delivered by universal tradition. Now of what certainty these decrees are, or rather, what true and rational certainty these decrees are apt and able of themselves to beget and settle in the minds of Catholicks, we shall hereafter examine and declare.

Con.

Concerning the truths of the fourth order, there is little to be said to our purpose, both because they doe no way belong to our design, as also because we shall hereafter examine what force humane ratiocination and discourse hath (which consists in the knowledge of the connexion of the premiffes with the conclusion) in relation to Divine Faith.

The Second Lesson.

Of divers things which are to be noted as requisite to the particular examination of these truths.

BEfore we descend to the particular examination of these truths, there be certain general and common principles and notions which need no disquisition; but are onely to be taken notice of before hand.

The first is that old and common saying, which I ever liked, to wit, that in *necessary* things concerning Religion, *Unity* is to be observed ; in *doubtful* things, *freedom* is to be given to all men; and in *all things*, *charity* is to be kept. This, I say, ever seemed to me very reasonable. By the first clause *heresie* is prevented, which can onely be in necessary things. By the second is prevented a certain *servitude and tyranny over mens minds*, which sometimes private interest, factions, and ambitious cabals, doe force men to such things as are uncertain, nay even to falsehoods now and then. By the third clause *Schism* is prevented, which of its nature breaks the bond
of

A common saying very true.

of Charity, and dissolves the union of mens minds in matters of Religion. But it is requisite, that we here explicate, and declare, what we mean by the words *necessary*, or *necessity*.

The necessity
of believing
according to
sense of some
Divines.

The resolution
of the ques-
tion in their
sense is doubt-
full.

When Divines dispute of the *necessity* of things that are to be believed, they commonly endeavor to note and mark out those Articles of faith and revealed doctrine, whereof the expresse and explicate belief (as they conceive) is wholly necessary to all Christians: The resolution of which question is so doubtful and uncertain amongst them, that they differ in this point (as they doe almost in every thing else) and are divided into, I know not how many several opinions. Which I remit to those, who have occasion to seek after them, being not to my purpose, especially their authors professing, they know nothing certainly therein: Yea the resolution of this question (as it is handled by Divines) is not only unprofitable, but even pernicious and impossible, as will appear most evidently to whomsoever shall examine the businesse without partiality. It is unprofitable, being no good can come to Christians by their resolution of this question.

Is pernicious.

It is pernicious in that Divines do commonly say, that only one or two articles, or (as some say) no particular one at all, is necessary to be believed by all Christians with an expresse and explicate act of faith; whereby many cold Christians do take occasion (what ever the truth be) to be careless, and neglect to obtain that degree of knowledge in the mysteries of our faith, which, if they were diligent, they might easily attain unto.

It

It is impossible, being 'tis manifest that there can be no particular rule given in matters of belief, nor any certain number of articles determined, which ought to be or can be common and necessary to every Christian in particular. And the reason is, because this doth depend of every individual mans natural capacity, of the means which every one may have to be instructed, and of many other circumstances, which in every particular mans life and disposition are so different, as that nothing can be determined of obligation common to all.

Is impossible.

We now therefore take this word *necessary*, in relation to things that are to be believed in another sense; for such articles of our Christian faith as we say are *necessary*, we do not mean, that they ought to be distinctly known, and expressly believed, and assented unto by every particular, and individual Christian; but we onely intend to designe out those Articles whereof the beliefe is esteemed by the whole Catholike Church to be such *essentiall* and *substantiall* points of Religion, as that whosoever will be deservedly and truly reputed a member thereof, must *necessarily* adhere unto them, at least *implicitly*, and indirectly; that is, believing at least in general, whatsoever the holy Catholike Church doth universally teach and believe as an article of revealed doctrine, and Divine faith. Infomuch, that whosoever should obstinately, and wilfully deny the least of any such articles, were to be excommunicated, and expelled out of the Churches Society. Much more if he should maintain the contrary, knowing

Another kind of necessity of believing.

it

it to be the sentiment of the whole Church, that it ought to be believed as an article of faith. And in this sense we shall hereafter take these words, *necessary* and *necessity*.

What is signified by these words *fundamentals* and *substantials* in matters of faith.

There is likewise another thing to be noted, to wit, what is to be understood by these words, *fundamentals*, and *substantials*, in Relation to Christian Religion. For there be certaine *Schismatics* in these our days, who perswade themselves that all Controversies in Religion amongst Christians, are but doubtful and indifferent disputes, which do not reach to, nor concern the *fundamental* points of Divine faith and worship; And therefore, that every man may profess in these disputed questions, what he pleaseth: nay, that he may and ought to profess that kind of Religion (so it be Christian) which his fellow Citizens, living under the same political Government (especially if it be commanded by the supreme power) do publicly profess and maintain.

The true signification of *fundamentals*.

That we may determine the proper and natural signification of these words, *fundamentals*, *substantials*, *essentials*, in as much as they have relation to our subject, we must call to mind what we have already said, to wit, that the chief and almost only cause of all controversies in Christian Religion, is the not discussing exactly, and thence the not knowing certainly the means by which all revealed doctrine ought to be delivered and communicated with an undiscontinued succession from age to age to the whole body and Society of Christians. The nature and condition of which means ought to be *unerrable* and *infallible* as we have already

ready shewed. Whence it doth likewise follow, that all revealed tenets, of what more or less importance soever they be, are to be believed with an equall degree of certainty and *infallibility*. For being this means is that by which all these articles and tenets are known to be revealed and true, the same cause in the same circumstances, must necessarily produce the same effect in relation to them all.

Now, that which is called *fundamentall* or *substantiall* in faith, may be compared two manner of waies: first to the forme and substance of faith considered in it self: Secondly to the subject or matter of faith, which is the thing we believe. In the first respect and consideration of all tenets, that are properly articles of faith, are equally *fundamentall* and *substantiall*, being they all rely upon the same principle ground and motive, and are all conveyed and communicated to the whole Church by the same means; and therefore cannot but have, all of them, the same degree of certainty or *infallibility*. Wherefore, in this consideration or respect, one point or tenet cannot be more a *fundamentall* then another. And upon the unity and *infallibility* of this same motive and means, is grounded the whole building of faith. Wherefore, all the articles of our Christian faith, are equally *fundamentals* in the consideration.

But if we compare *fundamentall* to the subject or thing which we believe, then one Christian dogme, or revealed truth, may be a foundation to another, and thence in some sort of a greater weight and moment then another. For example,

Fundamentall
is compared
two waies.

the mystery of the Incarnation is the ground and foundation of all the actions and operations which we believe Christ Jesus to have done or suffered upon earth ; and therefore, we are in some sort more interessed in the belief of God's incarnation, then we are in the belief of his birth of a Virgin ; And our belief of the former article, is, I say, in some sort, a presupposed foundation of the belief of the second. Whence it appears, that the objections of our Schismatical adversaries in this point, are founded upon the equivocal sense of the word *fundamentall*, which being taken away, they vanish into smoak, as doe all their arguments generally consisting in the ambiguity of the terms.

We shall hereafter have occasion to make a more full and particular disquisition of these truths, when we come to demonstrate what this means is, by which our revealed doctrine is to be conveyed to the Church, whereof we have already declared the nature and condition in general, and which indeed was the chief motive, wherefore I undertook this work.

The fifth Chapter.

Whether the holy Scripture can of it self be the means, whereby revealed truths are to be conveyed and delivered to the whole Church?

HAVING already shewed, that almost all controversies about Christian faith and Religion, do spring only from this head, to wit, that it is not agreed upon, nor evident to all, what may be the means, by which the revealed truths of Christian Religion are to be conveyed and delivered with an uninterrupted succession, and without danger of error to the whole Society of Christians. And having farther explicated and declared the nature and quality of this means in general, it now remaineth onely, that we find out this meanes in i'ts proper and particular condition. Now the first and most obvious thing which doth occur, as seeming to be made for this purpose, is the holy Scripture, wherefore our first question shall be.

The first Lesson.

What is the holy Scripture? And what is it for the Scripture to be Canonical?

THe holy *Scripture* is nothing else but a writing received by the Catholick Church, as
I 2 con-

containing revealed doctrine, or at least, nothing opposite to it, nor nothing contrary to any other truth whatsoever: whereof the author was ever held by several Doctors of the Church to be some sacred and divine writer, that is, to whom in writing that Book, or setting down that doctrine belonging to Religion, what he there writ, was either immediately revealed unto him by the holy Ghost, or he had at least some special assistance from Heaven in the penning of it.

The Scripture
must be recei-
ved by the
Church.

In this description of the holy *Scripture*, there be divers things to be noted. First, that this writing ought to be received by the whole Church, as fit and worthy to be put into the catalogue of sacred & Divine Books. And by this clause are excluded from this catalogue or Canon, all particular and private revelations, which are said to have been given to divers holy persons, though a great part of the Church do believe them.

Private revela-
tions are ex-
cluded from
being Scrip-
ture.

Secondly, that it is sufficient for a writing to be worthy of this Canon, that it do contain the same revealed doctrine which the universal Church doth believe and teach; And nothing, of what quality soever, either destructive of it, or opposite unto it; no nor contrary to any truth either natural or supernatural; I mean to such a truth, as is generally acknowledged by the universal consent of mankind.

Philosophicall
truths are not
to be proved
out of Scrip-
ture.

Thirdly, that philosophical truths are neither to be approved nor disapproved by the naked words or passages of the *Scripture*. For although the *Scripture* contain no falshood, yet its manner of speech is, for the most part, vulgar, that is, rather

ther adopted to the capacity of the common people, then to the exact propriety of the language. And therefore, as whosoever would frame the rules of Grammar, Poetry, Rhetorick, or of any other liberal art, out of the phrases or formes of speech, which are in the *Scripture*, he would certainly come short of the perfection and excellency of those Arts: So likewise, whosoever would prove and establish the truths of *Mathematics*, of *Astrology*, or of any other part of philosophy, out of such places and passages as are accidentally inserted into the holy *Scripture*, expressed after a vulgar manner of speech, would neither shew himself a Divine nor a Philosopher.

Fourthly, that the special and Divine assistance which is given to the author of every such book as the Church receives for the word of God, doth only extend it self to those things which are doctrinal, or at least have some neer or necessary relation unto them. But in those things which are written by the bye, or have reference to something else not concerning Religion, I conceive, the author had only such a Divine assistance as other holy and saintly authors have.

The authours of canonically bookes had only speciall inspirations from God in writing doctrinall points.

Now we are to consider, what it is for a Booke to be *Canonical*; And I find it to be nothing else, then for a Book to be reckoned, enrolled in the number or catalogue of the Divine Writings, with the unanimous consent of the universal Church. The substantial and essential nature of these Books or Writings, we have already defined, and have also explicated the two reasons or causes, wherefore they are thus received. The first, that

What is it for a written booke to be canonically.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

that this Book doth contain revealed doctrine, or at least nothing dissonant nor disageeing with it. The second, that the author of such a Book, was some such sacred and Divine writer as is above expressed. But we must see, what certainty the universal Church hath of these two grounds or principles.

How the universal Church doth know that a book is Canonical.

That the Church hath the greatest certainty that can be of the first ground, will appear most evidently by what we shall say hereafter, to wit, that the universal tradition of our revealed doctrine is *infallible* and *unerrable*, as we shall demonstrate anon.

Of the second ground, the Church hath not alwayes the same certainty, but may have sometimes more, sometimes lesse, according to the variety of the several circumstances which may occur, as of time, place, and the like. Let us put for example St. *Paul's* Epistle to the Romans; first we must think this Epistle was written privately by the Author, whosoever he was. Then it was delivered and sent by a particular messenger to that particular Church of the Romans. By those of that Church it was communicated to their neighbouring Churches and brethren, and so by little and little, it came to be divulged to the whole Catholicke Church through all the world. So that this Epistle (and the like may be said of every *Canonical* book) came to be received, and acknowledged by degrees, first by one Church, then by another, and at last by all. Now every particular Church, as soon as they heard this Epistle read, which was told them came from St. *Paul*, they presently

ſently gave their aſſents to the doctrine contained therein, partly becauſe it was ſent to them in *St. Paul's* name, but chiefly becauſe it was altogether conform, and different in nothing from that doctrine wherein they were inſtructed, and whereof they made profeſſion. But who was the Author of this Epistle, the very Church it ſelfe, to whom it was firſt ſent, could then have no other certainty, then what the meſſenger or other circumſtances could give them. Although by little and little this certainty did increaſe, and all Churches, even the fartheſt diſtant, were at length certified of the author of it. Yet was not this Epistle to be ſo inſerted into the catalogue of the ſacred Writings, as that it was ſo neceſſarily eſteemed by all for *canonicall Scripture*, until the whole Catholike Church had conſented thereunto, and given its ſentence therein; which for ſome parts of the *canonicall Scripture* (as the Epistle of *St. Paul* to the Hebrewes) we know was not done untill above Two hundred years after the death of the Author.

Whence it appears, that there be ſo many particular circumſtances involved in this queſtion concerning the Authors of *Canonicall Books*, as that it was ſometimes extreme hard for the Church to get an abſolute certainty thereof, whereof it was ſometimes leſſe, ſometimes more certain; And it is too long a buſineſſe, and unneceſſary for my deſign, to diſcuſſe theſe particular circumſtances. It is ſufficient for my purpoſe, that the Catholike Church can certainly diſcerne (as I ſhall hereafter demonſtrate) by her univerſal
and

and unanimous consent in the same revealed doctrine, whether a writing do contain any thing dissonant and disagreeing thereunto, or to any of the revealed tenets of that Divine faith, which the univerrally believes and professeth.

The boldnesse
of hererickes
concerning
canonicall
bookes.

Whence it is evident, how vain, frivolous, and senselesse a thing it is, nay what an impudent boldnesse, and rash temerity, that every private and single Heretick (trusting to I know not what slight conjectures, as the Criticks doe) shall dare take upon him to deny and refuse as *canonicall Scripture*, what ever he imagines not to be so, whilst at the very same time, the whole Catholike Church, with an unanimous and universal consent doth stand up, and cry out against him. Wherefore it is manifest, that it belongs only to the universal Church to determine and discern what writing is truly and certainly *Canonicall*.

It doth likewise follow out of what hath been said (which we shall make yet more cleer in the following lesson) that though it were true that all the revealed tenets and dogmes of the Catholike faith, are at least implicitly contained in the holy Scripture, yet can we not thence rightly infer, that the *Scripture* alone, were a convenient, and naturally proportionate means to communicate and convey all the Divine Tenets and Dogmes of our Catholike faith, unto the whole Society of the universal Church.

Why the fathers did
chiefly use the
Scripture dis-
puting against
heretickes.

Lastly, it is to be observed, that the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, refuting the heresies of their times in every age, did principally make use of the holy Scripture, to prove the truth of
the

the Catholike faith. Both because their adversaries would acknowledge no other authority (which is the property of all Hereticks) as also because out of the Scripture alone, understood in its natural sense, all the Articles of our Catholike faith may be truly evinced.

The second Lesson.

The holy Scripture alone cannot be a convenient means to convey all the revealed tenets of our Catholike faith to the whole body of the Catholique Church.

WHat we have already declared, and what is acknowledged by all Christians, we may now suppose, to wit, That Jesus Christ hath instituted an Evangelical law, containing divers Articles which are to be believed, and divers precepts of divine cult, which are to be practised; whereof he would have at least some certain chief heads to be believed, and observed under pain of eternal damnation. As also, that he hath provided some means, which may and will *infallibly* convey all necessary tenets and practises to the whole body of his following disciples, and that with a continual succession from age to age to the end of the world.

To this we may add, that the holy Scripture, if we look only upon the bare outside of the material letters and words, setting aside what sense or signification they may have, cannot possibly serve for a means to apply any doctrine whatsoever to

The words of the holy Scriptures without their sense cannot be a means to convey any revealed truths.

any company of men. It is therefore requisite that the sense and meaning of the Scripture be certainly and unerrably known to all Christians to whom it is to be a meanes of conveying revealed doctrine, at least the sense and meaning of those places and passages wherein the heads of Christian faith, and tenets of greater moment, are contained and expressed.

There is no one particular expositor of the holy Scripture who is infallible.

We may further suppose with our Adversaries, that there never was any man since the Apostles, nor is at this present upon earth, who by the sharpnesse of his wit, or abundance of his knowledge, no nor by reason of his authority, or of any Science whatsoever, though infused into him from heaven, can expound or explicate the sense and meaning of the whole *Scripture*, or of any part of it, so *infallibly* and unerrably, as that the whole body of Christians is obliged to believe or acquiesce unto his interpretation. I say, obliged either in vertue of the Authority, or of any other quality, which such an Expositor may have. Though if his Exposition be the same with the sense of the Fathers, and of the universal present church, it may be for this reason (whosoever the Interpreter be) most certainly and *infallibly* true.

Hereticks will have us suppose the Bible to be the word of God.

Being that all Hereticks doe resolve faith into the holy Scripture alone, or (which is indeed the same) doe averre that the holy Scripture alone is the meanes by which revealed doctrine is to be conveyed to all Christians; we are to note, that all these Hereticks will have us suppose and grant that the Book which we commonly call the *Bible*

ble, or the *holy Scripture*, is the Word of God. Which, if we should deny, either in regard of any part of it, or of the whole Book, I never yet found amongst them any so deep and solid a Divine, as that he could make this most clear and evident, without leaving any occasion of doubt; which unless it be absolutely and exactly proved, all the faith that is built upon this only principle, must needs be subject to error.

To clear this point, let us suppose an Apostata, *Luther* for example (for all heresies and schisms have sprung from some one Head or Captain) who shall dare forge and frame some new and unheard-of point of doctrine, as, That the *sacrifice of the Masse is Idolatry* (which *Luther* acknowledgeth to have learnt of the Devil. And this he takes upon him to prove out of the *holy Scripture*, or at least sayes it is so, because it is not in the *Scripture*. Now, who doth not see how easily, and without any examination or difficulty this Apostata believes us, when we deliver him a Book, which we tell him is the word of God; but how much he contradicts us when we tell him, that the *Masse is a holy Sacrifice*? Although at the same time we profess, that we equally believe them both, and upon the same grounds and motives. We tell him both of them are equally manifest unto us, nor can we by any means be more certain of the one then of the other. Both of them, say we, are delivered with an equal assurance of the same publick, universal, and common testimony of the present Catholick Church; that is, our belief of the one and

An example
of this in Lu-
ther.

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

the other is equally built upon universal tradition common to them both. Can we then deceive this Appostata in the one, and not in the other? or is the meanes by which our faith is conveyed from hand to hand, and from age to age, remaining still the same, sometimes fallible and subject to error, othertimes certain and infallible? or shall we leave this to be judged at the pleasure and fancy of this, or any other Apostata whosoever?

But he will answer, that the reasons and arguments by which these two tenets are to be proved, are far different: And those which may be brought in the defence and proof of the first position are far stronger.

All defection
from the Catholike
Church is unreasonable.

Certainly he were mad, if he would not say this. But he considers not in the interim that this his assertion is onely built upon his own private and particular ratiocination. Which whether it be a just and lawful ground for him thus to discern these tenets, and to accept the one as *infallible*, and reject the other as *false*, whilst at the same time the whole present Catholick Church, with universal assent, and unanimous consent, doth disclaim and detest his Rebellion, teaching and believing the contrary: Let any man of common sense be judge.

It is needless to say any thing here of the opinion & evasion which some Hereticks endeavour to make in this point, pretending that the *holy Scripture* gives testimony of it self; that it is the Word of God, bearing with it a certain light of the *Divinity*, by which it doth appear to surpass

all humane wisdom: For whatever may be the truth in this point, it is certain that few there be who can discover and discern this light, to wit, onely those who have attained to the height of heavenly knowledge and piety. And therefore such a rule of our Catholick and Christian faith in general as this, would never serve to bring the whole Church to the certain knowledge of all those articles of Christian doctrine, which ought to be common to all.

But let us suppose what these men would have; let this Book which we call the *Bible* or *Scripture* be the Word of God, and consequently free from all error and falshood, so the true sense and meaning of it be known.

Let us suppose also, as is said before, That there be divers Christian Truths, which both in belief and practice are necessary to be held, that is, both assented unto by our understandings, and practised by our external works, insomuch, that whosoever doth resist any of them, is neither to be esteemed a member of the Christian Society, nor worthy the name of a Christian.

This supposed, it is first evident by experience, that there both hath been, and are still, many Hereticks and Schismaticks, who, although they have and doe acknowledge the Scripture to be the Word of God, yet have they erred, and doe erre in divers points of our Christian Faith; yea and even in such as be of the greatest weight and moment. Nay, there is not any one point in Christian doctrine, not any one article of faith, not even in the Apostles Creed, wherein some

Though hereticks have acknowledged the Scripture yet have they erred from Christian truths.

He-

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

Hereticks, both ancient and modern, have not erred, and doe not erre. And yet all these Hereticks did and do acknowledge and receive the Scripture as the Word of God, and in appearance did and doe reverence it as such. Notwithstanding, I say, this their acknowledgement, they have erred both in faith and practise, even in all the points both of doctrine and divine worship belonging to Christianity; yea, even in those which are the chief grounds and main foundations of Christian Religion. Now this certainly could not have happened if we allow that Christ hath instituted the holy Scripture alone as a meanes whereby his doctrine was to be unerrably conveyed to the whole society of Christians. It is therefore evident, that the Scripture alone, though acknowledged as the Word of God, was not ordained to this end, nor hath produced this effect.

The chiefe
ground and
fundamentall
cause of their
thus erring.

This, if it were needful, might be easily proved and verified of every particular point, and of the chief heads and articles of Christian Religion and Doctrine, as of the *Trinity*, the *Incar-nation*, and the rest, which we will omit for the present, and refer it to the second part of this Treatise. This demonstration Logicians call *a post-eriori*, that is, from the effect. The same may be also demonstrated *a priori*, as they call it, that is, from the cause of this effect. For what reasonable man can deny, but that Christians acknowledging the *Scripture* to be the word of God, may expound and interpret those words and places by which any revealed truth is to be proved

(of

(of what *necessity* or importance soever that truth may be) in divers senses and meanings; so that there may arise amongst them great disputes and contentions about the signification of those words and about the meaning of those places and passages. Wherefore it is manifest, that the *Scripture* alone delivered to every man (learned or unlearned, moderate or passionate, godly or wicked) to be expounded as he shall think fit, cannot be a meanes to deliver and convey the true and self-same sense, free from error, of any one Article of Christian doctrine, to the whole society of Christians; much lesse to doe it with an undiscontinued succession for many ages. For being that Christians may fall into dispute about the sense of any place, and that they may expound it quite contrarily to one another (which of necessity must happen, where we put so many millions of men of several disposition to interpret the Law at their pleasure, without submission to any Judge) it is manifest that the true and natural sense of such a place cannot by such means be certainly and undoubtedly known to them all; much less can it be believed by them all with a divine assent, if it be an intellectual position, nor exercised by them all, if it belong to practise. Wherefore what passage soever we shall point out of the *holy Scripture*, and what Article soever it may concern; such a passage, I say, may not only be expounded in divers and different senses; but it is not possible that it should happen otherwise.

This we see experience it self doth witnesse by the two frequent and unhappy Rebellion of all
Apo-

John 10.
John 14.

Apostata's and Hereticks. For example, betwixt the *Catholicks* and the *Arians* (to omit many others of the same nature) *I and my Father are all one*, said the *Catholicks*. *My Father is greater then I*, said the *Arrius*. And thus *Arrians* invented and extorted a false sense, favourable to his error, out of these words of the holy *Scripture*. The *Catholicks* gave a true one, and that which they had received from their fore-fathers. And the like hath happened in all Heresies. Whence the ancient Hereticks called *Patermentes*, were condemned by the *sixth General Councel*, because they took upon them to expound the *Scriptures* as they thought fit, without submission to the Church.

Reasons why
the *Scriptures*
are interpreted
in divers senses

This must necessarily follow out of the very nature and condition of words, and of humane language.

1. First, because words are ordinarily ambiguous and equivocal, both in themselves, and in their circumstances.

2. Secondly, by reason of the nature and quality of the subject which we speak of, to wit, of *Divine Mysteries*, and supernatural things, hidden in the *light which no man can approach unto*.

3. Thirdly, because all these things now in question, were revealed and acted sixteen hundred years ago.

4. Fourthly, by reason almost all the circumstances of places, persons, times, accents, tones of speech, and the like, are almost all of them in their particulars unknown unto us. By which the sense and intention of the speaker may be much

The Analasys of Divize Faith.

much different from what the bare words and written syllables do seem to bear.

Fifthly and lastly, the variety of every individual mans particular disposition, who may come to read, or hear read the *holy Scripture*, doth clearly demonstrate the same; whether we consider, and compare the different dispositions of their understandings, or of their wills: For we dayly see, that from the diversity of mens natural capacities, and several degrees of their comprehension, men are born, as it were, apt to judge and opine diversly of every thing that is proposed. And thence we say every thing hath two faces. We likewise see, that the variety of mens appetites, wills, and desires, doth produce the same effect. And these wills and desires do depend (as we have noted already) upon infinite several motives and cupidities, which doe generally domineer and tyrannize with vioient influences into the judgements and actions of men.

In fine therefore it is evident, that the Books of the holy Scripture, especially of the New Testament (which is now chiefly in question) having been written, as it were, accidentally upon several occasions (what a rule of faith, or what a method of instituting a new Law is this?) a thousand and thousand times copied out by unlearned as well as by learned Clerks (what a number of faults must there not needs be in these pies) printed over and over, God knowes how many times, and in how many places (how different these Editions must be with various Le-

L

ctions,

ctions, let any man imagine?) translated into I know not how many tongues by particular and private men (with what security of a faithful expression of the true sense, who dare say?) These Books to be put into all mens hands, learned and unlearned, that they may be read, or at least heard read: And that every one shall thence gather and choole (of what disposition, wit, sex, or condition soever) what he thinks is to be believed and practised, without a Teacher, without a Guide, without an Expositor, at least whom he is bound to believe, or to whom he is bound to obey (what variety of opinions, and what confusion must there not necessarily follow out of this position in every thing belonging to Christian Religion?) so that in fine, I say, it is evident, that these Bookes thus circumstanced, can never be a meanes convenient, certain, and worthy of the Eternal Wisedome, whereby any one revealed Article can be transmitted and conveyed to the whole society of Christians, without change and danger of error; much lesse to doe it for a long continued *Series* of many Ages. Wherefore we may justly conclude it is impossible the *holy Scripture alone* should be a meanes to convey and communicate any revealed tenets to the whole Church, or to conserve any union in faith and practise in it, no nor even amongst a small number of men professing Christian Religion. Nay contrarywise, putting this to be the onely meanes to convey and continue revealed doctrine, and divine worship, it is impossible but that there should be perpetual discord,
dis-

dissention, and dispute amongst Christians, even in the most important tenets, and chief Articles of Religion. We must therefore either find out some other meanes, or ingeniously professe and acknowledge, that there is nothing whatsoever in all Christian Religion, either of belief or practise, *necessary and common to all Christians*; which is in effect to acknowledge there is no Christian Religion at all.

The Sixth Chapter.

Of every particular and private mans ratiocination in relation to the resolution of Divine Faith.

One onely Lesson.

Whether Divine Faith ought to be resolved into every particular and private mans ratiocination.

Although the same reasons wherewith we have demonstrated even now that the *holy Scripture* alone cannot serve all Christians as a secure meanes whereby revealed tenets may be conveyed unto them. Although, I say, these same reasons doe equally prove the like against the discourse and ratiocination of every particular and private man; yet because there is a great disparity and difference between these two questions,

both in their matter, and in their form, I thought it fit to discusse this question under this Title, wherein I will endeavour to note and decide briefly several things much conducing to our purpose.

We doe not now enquire, whether the certainty of the knowledge of our external senses, accompanied with the ratiocination of every particular and private man, be not sufficient to discover the *meanes* by which revealed tenets are to be conveyed and communicated to the whole society of Christians. Nor whether the discourse and ratiocination of every particular man may not be able and sufficient to discover the nature and quality of the *meanes* we enquire after, to wit, that it ought to be of its own nature able to convey these revealed tenets to the whole body of Christians without possibility of error. These points we have already discussed, and have demonstrated most evidently, that this *meanes* which we seek after, ought to be most undoubtedly perceptible to every particular mans external senses, I mean, that there *is* such a thing: As also, it ought to be most *infallibly* certain by discourse, that this *meanes* is apt and able of its own nature to communicate and convey without error the revealed tenets of Christian Religion to the whole body of Christians.

The state of
the question.

But we now enquire, and dispute the question, Whether the ratiocination and discourse of every particular and private man, be, or can possibly be, this very *meanes* it self, which we seek after.

For

For the resolution of this question, divers things are to be noted. As first, whereas we have already said, that the *means* which we seek after, ought to be certainly evident to all; to wit, that it doth *exist*: And also, that its nature and condition ought to be such as we have declared. This second part of this position is to be discreetly understood. For being we say that its nature and quality is to be discovered by discourse and ratiocination, there may be two sorts of obstacles which may hinder some particular men from discovering of it.

How it is to be understood that the means by which faith is to be conveyed ought to be notorious to all.

The first is the natural weakness and imbecility of some particular mens understandings, which now & then is so great, that we find divers who are not onely incapable to penetrate into the bottom of abstruse and hidden truths, but are even unable to comprehend such things as are easie to be understood.

The second is a certain cupidity of interest, or other passionate disposition of the mind, which doth very often hinder several men (otherwise able and understanding) from comprehending such truths as are most evident and manifest to any indifferent man. It is these mens fault that they are prepossessed with such darknesse in their minds, as that they cannot understand what they see. But for the others, it is their punishment that they can clearly penetrate those truths which they ought in some sort to understand. But Gods Divine Goodness hath happily provided for these mens weakness, being they may have a certainty, yea and in some sort a rational one, of the revealed do-

Heb. 13.

doctrine which is proposed unto them by their Pastors and Governors. For since they are committed to the charge and care of *those who have the rule of them, whom they must obey, and to whom they must submit themselves, and who watch, as being obliged to give an account of their soules.* It is sufficient for them that these Governors appointed Pastors and Rectors over the Christian Church or Congregation, be obliged to have a most certain and evident knowledge of the *infallibility* of this *meanes*, by which their revealed doctrine is to be delivered from age to age, whereof we shall have occasion to speak more amply hereafter.

It is to be supposed for the discussion of this question that there are some revealed things.

Secondly, it is to be noted, that this question doth suppose there is a Christian Religion, and that in this Christian Religion there be divers revealed tenets, and that these tenets are to be certainly found either in the Scripture, or somewhere else. For it is not possible that any revealed points of doctrine should be found out, either by such an easie ratiocination as may be common to all men, or by such an exact & strong perquisition, as some few particular men may be able to make, unlesse we suppose them to be either in the holy Scripture, or somewhere else. Now we have sufficiently shewed in the precedent Chapter, that every particular mans ratiocination out of the words and passagsof the ho'y Scripture alone, cannot be a meanes to communicate and convey *infallibly* to every member of the Christian Society, the revealed doctrine of the Christian Religion. It resteth therefore, that we enquire

quire whether they can be certainly found out else-where, by the force of every particular mans ratiocination alone, and of what effect humane discourse is in relation to this point.

Thirdly, it is to be noted, that this question may be understood two manner of waies. First, whether the ratiocination of every particular man, can be an *infallible means* to communicate and convey the very revealed articles themselves, and dogmaticall points of faith to every individual member of the whole Christian Church. Secondly, whether, at least upon supposition, that such or such tenets are revealed articles of divine faith, humane ratiocination cannot draw from them such sequels and consequences as may have the like force, and same degree of truth, as have the articles themselves.

This question may be proposed two waies.

For the cleare solution of the first part of this question, we are to acknowledge in a word, that the Articles of Christian faith, being revealed and supernaturall truths, are not to be found out by any humane ratiocination, as we have said already; but are first to be supposed, and consequently grounded and built upon authority. And to think, that after the first revelation of these divine truths, humane ratiocination should be a fit *means* to continue them uncorrupted to the end of the world, is most ridiculous. For if we allow it as lawfull to every particular and private man or woman, of what natural capacity, disposition, or profession soever, without a guide, without a judge, without an interpreter, to determine, resolve, and imbrace, whatever their own singular and

Ratiocination cannot be the means neither to finde out, Nor to convey the articles of our faith.

and private ratiocination shall tell them is, or is not, a revealed article of supernaturall faith, what is commanded or forbidden by Christ Jesus (upon what ground, or motive soever they shall build this their ratiocination.) If, I say, we allow and give this liberty to every individuall person, how ever conditioned or qualified, it is more then evident, that there will not remain any thing either of belife or practise in the whole fabrick of Christian Religion, which can be thought common and necessary to all Christians, and consequently the whole building of Christian Religion must of necessity fall to the ground.

Consequences
drawn from
points of faith
may be of two
sorts.

The second part of this question hath much more difficulty in it, which may be also understood two wayes: for either such a sequel and consequence as we speak of, deducted out of the Principles and Articles of faith, is so evident at the first sight to every man of common sense, as that it cannot be doubted of by any man of an ordinary understanding: or there may be required some skill and learning, to comprehend the evidence of such a consequence. The sequels of the first sort, are indeed points of faith, and are to be reduced to the first order and class of revealed and Christian truths, as we have explicated them above. And the reason is, because the universal consent of all men in any truth immediately belonging to our revealed and supernatural belief, is a convenient foundation to build an assent of Divine faith upon it. And this I say, not only in relation to Theological faith which a particular Divine may have by means of his learning: but also

also in order to our Catholike faith, whereof we now speak

To make this more cleer, let us put an example: The Church hath defined against the *Monothelits* that there be two *wills* in Christ, which, supposing there be truly in Christ two *natures*, *Divine* and *Humane*, doth so manifestly follow, to wit, there be also two *wills* in him, that no man of common sense can doubt of it: being that every one knows that the *will*, or faculty of willing, is essentially annexed to the substance of every intellectual nature. Wherefore, this sequel doth absolutely belong to the first classe of Christian truth. When I say, that the universal consent of men is a convenient foundation whereupon to build an assent of Divine faith in things immediately belonging to our revealed points of Religion; this is to be understood, according to those principles which we have already laid down. For example, we have not this truth, *that the Scripture is the word of God*, by any revelation, but only by the universal consent of all Christians. Nor this likewise, *that there was a Councel of Nice, or of Trent*; which we know only by the universal and common consent of men, and yet upon these truths, are in some sort grounded our revealed Articles of Divine faith. But of this point we shall speake more fully hereafter, when we come to treat of universal Tradition, and of the definitions and Decrees of Councils.

Some of these consequences are most evident.

The sequels or consequences of the second sort, are of another nature; for their certainty depends upon the knowledge which some particular and

Some are doubtful.

M

private.

private men may have, of the connection of the premises with the consequence, which doth not suffice, though the men be never so learned or holy, to ground an Article of our Catholike faith; for although this demonstrative certainty may produce and beget Theological faith (which therefore may encrease amongst the learned) yet would it never be able to ground any point of our Catholike faith, which cannot be augmented and multiplyed. And this because these private mens particular ratiocination, is not a convenient *means* to certifie all sorts of reasonable men, much lesse to convey supernatural and revealed truths to the whole society of Christians For though we should grant, that this may be a *means* to convey an implicitly revealed truth to the learned and skilfull, and this with more or less certainty, according to the degree of each ones discoursing faculty, or capacity in learning, yet can it not ever reach to that common and universall certainty which is required to the *means*, whereby we are all of us to come to know the tenets of our Catholick faith, as we have already shewed.

One may believe all the articles of our faith, and yet not be truly a Catholick in his faith.

Hence it follows (which is to be specially noted) that if any man should believe all the articles of our Catholick faith, nor more nor lesse, but should assent unto them by the force of his own private and particular ratiocination; because, forsooth, he thinks, that all these tenets are either expressly set down in the Scripture, or at least, that they are so implicitly contained in it, as that he conceives, he can manifestly deduce them all from thence. So that his assent and adhesion to these

these articles is such, as that he would not believe them, unlesse he thought he could evince them out of the Scripture; This man, I say, were no Catholick, nor could be rightly esteemed a member of the Catholick Church. For since the *means* whereby this believer doth apply unto himselfe all these revealed truths, is no other then his own private ratiocination, he could not be said to have a certain and *infallible* faith, but onely an opinion of the truth of these tenets, being it is manifest that no particular and private mans ratiocination and discourse can be a *means* convenient and able of it selfe, to ground an assent of *Divine, infallible, and Catholick faith*; but onely will beget an opinative judgment, or at most a Theologicall faith. And the reason is, because such a particular mans faith, or rather opinion, upon the change of any circumstance and upon the variation either of his understanding in relation to the arguments and motives of his assent, or of his will and passion in relation to their incitements, may turn into a quite opposite sentiment; which in him, who hath a true Catholike faith, and is of a Catholike Religion can never happen. For by changing his sentiment, he must leave the Catholike faith and Religion, to follow his own private conceite, and so makes his believe and Religion particular: And therefore we may conclude, that all true faith and Religion is either Catholike and universall, or none at all; As we shall shew more fully hereafter.

The seventh Chapter.

Of particular inspirations and instincts of the Holy Ghost, in as much as they may have relation to the resolution of Christian Faith.

One onely Lesson.

Whether Divine Faith ought to be resolved into the instinct of the Holy Ghost inspired into every particular person.

The opinion
of those who
rely upon the
private spirit,

Certainly I had never believed some millions of Christians could really perswade themselves, that by a private and special instinct of the Spirit of God, it is revealed and inspired into every individual person, whatsoever doth any way concern or belong to Religious and Divine worship, to the frame and building of a godly life, and to the prosecution and attaining of eternal salvation; insomuch that they have no need at all of any order or method in Ecclesiastical discipline, of any rule or guide in Christian Faith, of any use of Sacraments; or, in fine, of any other help or assistance whatsoever consisting in external action. I should never, I say, have believed, that any considerable number of Christians should come to this folly and madness, if my own eyes and ears had not often assured me of this their ridiculous assertion.

But

But these weak and pitifully-deceived people, doe little comprehend the secret mysteries of the operations of the Spirit of God, the hidden and abstruse wayes and paths of the works of the holy Ghost, they know not what is an instinct of Gods Spirit, in what manner he works, by what means or instruments he doth act, what certainty there is of what, when, where, and how he doth exercise his special and peculiar force, what be the spiritual effects of his sacred operations in every single man. These, and many things more of the same nature, which lie occult in the impenetrable secrets of his Divine wisdom, are altogether unknown to these poor souls. Whence these men, whilst they vainly believe and boast themselves to be imbued and governed in all things with the same Spirit which Christ himself was, doe easily, though ignorantly, fall into innumerable blasphemies. These blind, though sometimes well-meaning people, imagine themselves to be the elect of God, to be the Saints of Christ; and to them (as they perswade themselves) is given the dominion of the whole world by Gods special providence. These misled men are so far transported, as that they pretend to discern what's Divine, and what's humane in the Scriptures, and thence correct them at their pleasures. And in fine (which most concernes my purpose) they doe not onely resolve Divine faith into their spirit (which they will have to be the holy and divine Spirit of God, wherewith they vainly brag themselves to be possessed) singly infused into every particular person; but also they dare

Certain hard questions in this matter.

dare affirm, that they can every day make a new faith by means of their dayly inspirations and revelations.

They reject
all authority
and reason.

Me thinks the very rehearſal of theſe weak and phantaſtical imaginations, were a ſufficient confutation of them. But (which is the ground of all their folly) theſe people doe wave all arguments againſt them, by an evaſion no leſs impertinent then are their poſitions. For there is no proof, of what nature ſoever, but it is grounded either upon reaſon or authority; and theſe men will neither acknowledge any ſuperiour authority in matters belonging to Divine Faith and Religion (and therefore ſome call them *Independents*) nor will they admit that Chriſtian Religion ought to be conſonant to the principles of reaſon. Whereupon they take away, and deſpiſe all *authority* under God, in things belonging to Religion, and they obſtruct the uſe of reaſon, in relation to belief, godlineſſe, and eternal ſalvation. Nevertheleſſe, we have thought it fit to note briefly ſome few points, amongſt very many and very hard difficulties in this ſubject, that every one may ſee and know with what ſpirit theſe weak and ignorant men are guided.

It is certain
that there are
ſome inſpirations
of the
holy Ghoſt.

That there are certain ſpecial inſtincts given from heaven to ſome particular men, both the expreſſe teſtimony of the holy Scripture, and the univerſal hiſtorical tradition of Chriſtianity, doe moſt certainly convince. Which becauſe no man denies, and amongſt other proofes, the miraculous vocation of *St. Paul* doth take away all poſſibility of doubt, we will ſuppoſe it for the preſent

sent to be true. There are therefore some special instincts; *special*, I say, both in respect of their matter, and of their manner. For no man that ever I heard of, doth say that these instincts (which are indeed priviledges) are of the same nature in all Christians to whom they are given, and therefore they are different in their substance. Likewise in their manner and wayes by which these graces are given, they are wholly different, not onely in respect of their measure and degree, but also in their nature and condition. This all acknowledge; and hence it is that these graces and favours are commonly called *extraordinary*. Not that we are to believe that any thing doth or can fall out in the whole *series* of created beings, which is out of the order prefixed by Gods divine providence, no not even miracles themselves, but because such things doe seldom happen, if we look upon the ordinary and accustomed course of things. And therefore such things are said to be done above the ordinary course of natural causes.

Now we are to enquire what is an *instinct*, or an *inspiration* of the holy Ghost, speaking in general; which indeed is nothing else but a certain heavenly and divine motion, sometimes in the understanding, and sometimes in the will, which is given to man purely out of Gods Goodness and mercy, and which doth dispose, incite, and guide mansoul to true piety and perfect godliness.

What is an instinct of the holy Ghost.

There be severall sorts of these heavenly motions, whereof some are more special priviledges than others, and rarely given to some particular

Several sorts of inspirations.

and

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

and private person. Some of them are *transient*, others *permanent*. These, like unto the habitudes of the mind, doe inhere in the soul, and give her a great facility in the practise of her godly operations. Those, like flashes of fire, are sparks of the Divine light, which pass away gliding, as doth the lightning. Some there be which are acquired by discourse often reiterated, and by ratiocination from divine principles and revealed truths.

Others are got by the exercise and practise of Theological and supernatural vertues. By these, and the like heavenly motions, the Christian soul is made perfect, both with increase of new degrees in divine knowledge, and with greater fervor in the love of God.

God doth not
work but by
the mediation
of second
causes.

There be some who think the very Deity it self, and substance of God, doth immediatly produce these sublime and Saintly effects of grace, in certain chosen and blessed soules: insomuch, that he useth not any instrument or second cause in these operations, but doth work these effects by the exhibition, as it were, of his own person, as fire doth in the iron. But I could never understand, much lesse assent unto these mens opinion. For, as I ever thought it to be the nature and duty of the first cause, and supream disposer of all things, to appoint and settle such an order in all things that were to be in the whole *Series* and duration of creatures, as that nothing could possibly be said to be *contingent* in relation to his providence: So likewise, I conceived that all effects and productions, of what quality or condition soever, ought to be composed and placed in such a certain

certain determinate and fixed connexion and concatenation one with another, as that from the first beginning of creatures, that is, from the first moment of the worlds foundation, until the last period of its duration, all things ought of necessity to run upon a constant thread, and immutable course, without possibility of alteration.

There is another kind of Divine light, or instinct of Gods Spirit specially given to certain particular men, which we call *Propheſie*, which doth principally regard such material and contingent things, as are distant in relation either to time or place. The force and vertue of this instinct is neither permanent, nor doth it sanctifie the person in whom it is. These Prophets are called *Seers*, both by reason they doe behold and contemplate the causes of things in the Book (as we call it) of Gods *preſcience*; as also, because they doe sometimes speculate the *Ideas* or images of things, which are either in their external senses, or in their fancies or imaginations. Of these instincts there be divers sorts, whose proper and peculiar natures, and whose several manners of operation, yea and whose various effects, it were too long a businesse to discusse and declare at the present, nor would it be any thing to our purpose.

What is the
ſpirit of Pro-
phetic.

Farther, we may note and adde to what we have said in the third Chapter, touching the certainty of revealed doctrine, and of Divine Instincts; to wit, that since Revelation is a kind of Divine Instinct, which doth enlighten the understanding, it may be supernatural, either in its sub-

What is Re-
velation.

N

ſtance,

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

stance, or in the manner of its being. In its substance, when the thing revealed is above the knowledge and comprehension of any creature. In its manner of being, when the thing it selfe may be known by the force of nature, but not by that way and meanes by which it is known by relation.

Two wayes of
Revelation.

The certainty
of external
Revelation.

To make this more clear and easie to be understood, we are to note that there are two wayes by which revelations are made *externally* and *internally*. The certainty of *exteanal* revelations may arise to that degree of assurance, which our external senses are able to afford. That is to say, it may mount to that extent of *universality*, by the severall testimonies of divers senses, as may be fully sufficient to produce the greatest sort of adhesion; which, as we have already said, the Apostles had, and perhaps *Moses* and others. Yet it may be, that a very holy man may evidently know, that the certainty which he hath of some Divine Revelation, is beyond all possibility of error. I say, it may be that a saintly man, in some cases, may be able to evince with an evident demonstration, that his certainty is so well grounded upon the severall testimonies of divers of his senses, and so grown to that height of universality, that it is impossible that the very Devil, transforming himself into an Angel of light, should be able to produce such a certainty. And this he may perhaps evince from this ground, That it were a thing altogether incongruous and unworthy of the Divine providence, to permit and concur to the production of such an effect as this, which

which we suppose to be totally destructive of the most constant and immutable order of nature. But whatever the truth be in this particular point, it is manifest by what we have said, that there may be a perfect certainty of an external revelation, by the several testimonies of divers external senses, so that their operations be extended to a due proportion, and convenient degree of *universality*.

As for *internal* revelations, they are all made by the means of the internal senses, and *Ideas* or Images which are in the imagination. For this being a natural and easie way of producing such effects, it were a folly to invent or conjecture any other. If this *internal* revelation happen in a thing that may be known by a natural and demonstrative ratiocination, then it is clear, that not onely a certainty, but even an evidence may be had of the truth of such a thing. And in this case, that which would be extraordinary, and above the common course of such an Agents manner of working, would consist in some special direction and particular ordering of the *Ideas* and images in the fancy. But if this *internal* revelation do happen in some thing that doth so exceed the power of any created intellectuall faculty, as that it could never have come to the knowledge of it, then there can be no evidence had of the truth of such a thing, though perhaps a saintly man may have some kind of certainty or assurance of it, according to the state of his personal disposition, and of the circumstances wherein he may be. But whether another may not deservedly doubt of the truth of

How internal Revelations are made.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

such a revelation as this, nay whether this faintly man himself ought to adhere so strongly and fixedly to this revelation, as that he should thinke it impossible for him to be deceived by the Divell, this I cannot determine. In the interim, it seems to me very evident, that in these revelations, God doth not immediatly create new *Ideas* or images, to imprint them into such a faintly mans imagination, but that he only directs those, which are either then actually in it, or which it selfe doth then frame in vertue of some precedent causes, and disposeth them to that effects which his wisdom and goodnesse intends to produce; for it is manifest that though there may be evidence in him who doth declare and testifie a revealed thing, of the truth of his revelation: yea though it may be evident to some particular believer that God hath told and declared that which is proposed unto him to believe; yet would not this particular mans evidence of his revelation be a sufficient ground for the universal Church to build her Catholick faith upon. Nay farther we may say even of the Apostles themselves, to whom it was altogether evident that their revelations were true ones, and consequently that the things and doctrine revealed unto them was also true; yet had they not confirmed the truth of their revelations and doctrine by visible and manifest miracles, they had not laid sufficient grounds of an universal and rational faith unto all nations.

What ordinary
revelations
are.

Those revelations which some godly men are said to have very often, (amongst which it is very hard to distinguish the true and certain ones, from
the

the false and imaginary ones) I ever thought them to consist in a certain fixed and constant fancie, strongly adhering to its object, whether true or false. Which is sufficient (when they are true ones) for the production of those effects, where-with the Divine goodnesse hath designe to blesse such soules. Which we ought not believe, are bestowed upon any, but upon the faithful children of Christ and his Church, whereof the greatest mark is, a true and profound humility. And of these revelations I certainly think, that for the most part, there is neither any evidence, nor any *rationall* certainty to be had of them.

Hence it is manifest, how vaine and frivolous a thing it is to resolve our Christian faith into the private instinct of the spirit of God. Nay how this assertion doth utterly destroy it selfe. For all the arguments and reasons by which we have demonstrated, that neither the holy Scripture alone, nor the particular ratiocination of every private, and individual man, can be a secure *meanes*, whereby all Christians may come to know, and receive the revealed truths of Christianity without danger of error, for many ages together, may be urged with the like force against this impertinent, and foolish imagination.

Faith cannot
be resolved
into the pri-
vate spirit.

Farther it is clear, that this proud and fictitious conceite, is a thing altogether impossible. For first, we must either say, that this instinct of the Divine spirit is given to all Christians, or only to some few and select people.

This spirit is
not given to
all.

If the first, then it is no more a priviledge, a special grace, a particular gift, but common to all.

If

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

If the second, what shall we say of those, who have not this grace? How shall they know and understand these revealed truths upon whom this special gift is not bestowed? These men without doubt have no rule of faith, since they want the means by which every one is to come to know and believe the revealed mysteries of our Christian Religion. For although some doe brag, that that they have this gift of the spirit, yet being they cannot manifest this to an other, it cannot be of any use to their neighbours. Wherefore, unlesse this instinct of the spirit be given to all, at least in some degree, it cannot possibly serve to the common good of Christians; I mean, in relation to give unto them all, a certain knowledge of our revealed tenets.

Besides, he that brags that he hath this spirit, that he is indowed with this gift, nay and vants that he is most certain of it, he cannot give us the least note, signe, or marke of the truth of his certainty. And yet he will have us to suppose (which is strange) that he is thus possessed with the Divine spirit, and thence pretends, that we ought not to oppose him either with authority or reason.

But shall we then say, that true instincts and inspirations of the spirit of God, are not to be followed and obeyed? God forbid. Yet what understanding man may not justly stick to believe, that such pretended extraordinary operations of the Divine spirit; that such unaccustomed motions of Gods grace, are so frequently to be found in so many private persons. Nor can we indeed

deed be certified of this truth, otherwise then by the effects. And therefore *Doe not* (saith the Evangelist, 1 John 3.) *believe every spirit. Doe not* (saith the Prophet Jerem. 23.) *hearken to the Prophets who speak the visions of their own hearts. Woe be to the foolish Prophets* (saith Ezek. 13.) *who follow their own spirit, and see nothing.*

Now to say that this spirit is given to all in some degree, is most ridiculous; for certainly there be most grievous errors amongst Christians; and there be some who professe themselves to be Christians, who doe erre most shamefully in the chief points of Christianity, and therefore they cannot be imbued with this Divine Spirit. Noy, there be very many who think themselves to be full of this spirit, and yet they oppose one another both in words and works, and this even in our chief revealed tenets, even in the heads of our Christian doctrine, who sure cannot both of them be in the truth, nor consequently both of them inspired with the spirit of truth. Wherefore the effects of this private Spirit are uncertain & doubtful, being even those, who with an equal right (for any thing we know) doe boast and pretend to be possessed with this Spirit; doe so bitterly contradict one another. What confusion? what disorder in Religion must there not of necessity arise from this position? Will these men acknowledge, that every one may and ought to follow that Spirit wherewith he thinks or imagines himself to be moved? yea, and to whatsoever the bent of this Spirit doth seem to carry him, though it be to murther, to adultery, or the like? If it should come

Why this Spirit cannot be said to be given to all.

Gen. 22.

Ofc. 1.

Acts 6.

come into the mind of some of these people, that they had an instinct, and an expresse command from God (as *Abraham* had) to sacrifice their own sons: or that it were ordained them from heaven (as it was to *Oseas*) that they should take to them a wife of whordoms, and beget children of whoredoms, ought they presently to put this in execution? or were it lawful for such an one to say, *Who shall resist the Spirit that speaketh in us?* Finally, let any man judge, that is not quite out of his wits, whether this were convenient. Nay, whether it were not most ridiculous to say that it is lawful for all sorts of people, whether men or women (with all the rest of the circumstances expressed in the last Chapter) to have the liberty to perswade themselves that they are fully possessed with the Divine Spirit; and thence to believe, work, preach, and prophesize whatever they imagine they are moved unto, all canonical instruction ceasing, all study of divine and humane learning laid aside, all exercise of Religion cast away; and in fine, all other external meanes whatsoever neglected, which are naturally accustomed to guide, promote, and enflame mankind, especially the common people, to the practise and love of Divine worship. Surely these people doe not think themselves men but Angels, being they endeavor to abolish from Religious cult, and Divine service, all external, sensible, and corporal meanes, which doe powerfully move and stir up the minds of men by the impression of their *Ideas* and Images, sucked up by our senses.

Yet would I not have these people think they
are

are the first inventers of this imaginary Fiction. There have been very ancient Hereticks, as *Marcus Colorbassus*, cited by St. *Irenaeus*; *Apelles*, cited by *Iertulian*; *Cerintus*, and others, who did pretend to receive their Doctrine by Revelation; and therefore preferred it before any Apostolical writing, or tradition whatsoever. There have been others also called *Renchyta*, or *Massaliani*, whom St. *Basil* and St. *Epiphanius* do refute: These men were called *Enthusiaste*, because they rejected all meanes, though never so convenient, conducing to godlinesse, save onely prayer; and that to be made *ex tempore*, and without any preparation. Neither did the Church then condemn these men (as indeed it is not the Churches custome to doe it at any time) because these Tenets were against the private spirit of some particular man, which it would have done, had that been the rule of faith; but because those Tenets were opposite to the universal belief and general consent of the whole Catholick Church then in being.

But I am weary and ashamed to dwell thus long upon such a frivolous subject, especially when I consider what sort of men these commonly be, who boast themselves to be thus familiarly and frequently replenished with these Divine Instincts, and with these heavenly communications with the Spirit of God. Who would not think their dayly and continual exercise were to live perpetually in celestial contemplations? Who would not think them to be some noble minds, separated from all commerce

O

with

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

with vulgar and worldly people, leading most heavenly lives, abstracted from all earthly cogitations, enjoying a supreme quiet, and full tranquillity of soul? Would any man take them to be the Lee of the people? living in the noise of tumults, and confusion of alarms and uproars? What? Are these Divine Instincts of the Spirit? these sacred inspirations? these holy communications and familiarities, even with the Deity itself? Are they, I say, to be found so commonly in the horrid clashing of Armour, and continual effusion of Christian blood? *Let the circumcised Jew believe it, not I.*

The Eighth Chapter.

Of the Universal and Catholick Tradition of the revealed Articles of Christian Faith.

The First Lesson.

Of universal tradition considered in general.

What is tradition considered in general.

T*radition* considered in general, is nothing else but a verbal conveyance or communication of any truth, whether written or unwritten, with a continual succession of time or years from hand to hand, and from father to son, and so from age to age.

I said, of *any truth*; for although a falsehood may

may be in some sort as certainly conveyed (all circumstances concurring alike) by tradition as a truth; yet this doth no way prejudice our designe, being we dispute onely of the security and *infallibility of Tradition*. For example, if the *Mahometans* tradition be a secure and certain means whereby the Turks may believe that there was a *Mahomet*, and that they now profess the same doctrine which he delivered and preached unto their forefathers, it imports not, in relation to our purpose, how false and filthy their doctrine be; for we now treat of the *means*, and not of the truth of the doctrine. Nay, it may be that a falsehood, even under the notion of a falsehood, may be most certainly conveyed by *tradition*: As the Fables of the Poets, which have been transmitted and conveyed from age to age by a faithful tradition, even under the notion of fictions. But we now treat only of the tradition of truths, and of Christian truths.

A tradition of a false thing may be venerable.

By how much any *tradition* is more *universal*, by so much it is the more strong and certain; which is to be understood chiefly of the *universality* of place. For by how much farther are extended the multitudes of men, and the societies of several Countreys and Nations, who do convey and communicate the same truth by *tradition*, by so much more will the *tradition* of such a truth be free from all danger of error. And the reason is, because it is much lesse probable, or rather it is much lesse possible, that far extended multitudes of men, and societies of divers Nations and Countries, should all of them *universal-*

By how much more universal any tradition is, by so much the more secure and strong it is.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

ly desist from reporting and relating such a truth as hitherto hath been delivered by *tradition*; and thence, that the faith and knowledge of such a truth should perish: or that all of them should agree in some one thing opposite to this hitherto delivered truth. This, I say, is much lesse possible in such numbers of men, than that some few persons should doe the one or the other: And therefore a defection from such a *tradition* in many, is much less possible then in few.

Examples of
several tradi-
tions.

Amongst many examples that might easily be brought of this proposed case, we will only take one, to wit, That there was a *Julius Caesar*. First it is evident by what we have said in the 3. Chapter, that no man can doubt but that he hath heard this related. Then we may add, that being the belief and knowledge of this truth hath been universally delivered through all *Europe* (not to speak of the rest of the world) with a continued *Series* of ages from hand to hand, and from father to son, it is impossible that such a tradition should cease and perish throughout so many extended multitudes of men, and so many societies of several Nations and Kingdoms. Much lesse were it possible, that such multitudes of men, different and distant in so many respects and circumstances, should agree amongst themselves, to preach and publish any thing formally opposite and contrary to this truth. A man might as well say, that all mankind may perish throughout all *Europe*, as that the tradition of such a truth may quite desist.

Let us put another example of a tradition of a
lesse

lesse extent and *universality*, to wit, That *England* was conquered by *William Duke of Normandy*. Although this tradition be not sustained and kept on foot by as many multitudes of men, and as many societies of several Nations as the former, yet is there not in all *England* any man of an ordinary understanding, civility, and education, but doth know, and doth not doubt of this truth, although it be a thing done almost six hundred years ago.

The main foundation therefore of this truth, that is, of the *infallibility of universal tradition*, considered in general, consists in this, That an *universal tradition* cannot fail but one of these two ways; either by a total cessation of the tradition it self, and consequently of the knowledge and belief of the thing that is delivered by it, or by bringing in a contrary belief. Neither of which can happen where the tradition is raised to a convenient and due proportion of extent and *universality*. That is to say, no vast and far-extended multitudes of men; no great number of societies consisting of divers Nations and Kingdoms, dwelling separate in many distant parts of the world, without any cause of pre occupation in their affections, and without any mutual commerce or interest, in relation to the destruction of the thing thus reported and delivered, can possibly either wholly desist from the relating and delivering of such a thing as was related and delivered unto them; or conspire with a common consent to introduce and divulge the contrary.

The foundation of this truth.

This

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

This I thought fit to note here by the way (which I shall declare and shew more fully hereafter, as particularly belonging to Divine tradition) because it is common to all *universall traditions*, though purely human. But henceforth we will treat of Divine tradition; and we shall hereafter take occasion to shew their different conditions. For the present we will only advertise the reader, that some *universall traditions* are called *human*, because they do relate, and deliver human affaires, but that tradition which we speak of, we call *Divine or sacred*, because it doth relate, and deliver such things as are either immediatly and directly sacred; or at least do belong to *Divine*, and revealed truths. But before we enter into the particular discussion of the nature of this tradition, we must first seek and consider the nature and condition of the *Church*, which we will briefly examine in the subsequent lesson.

The second Lesson.

of the Christian Church.

Whether it be not some mens office and function to have a care that the tradition of revealed things be continued.

Having already declared in the presedent lesson, what *tradition* is, to wit, a delivery or conveyance by word of mouth, and from eare to eare of something that is thus spoken and related, it doth necessarily follow, that this must be done and effected by *Men*. We are therefore to enquire to whom it belongs to convey, and communicate this Christian tradition. That is, whether the *tradition* of revealed truths is to be transmitted after the same manner, as *human tradition* is, to wit, without any order, method, or discipline, but as it

it were by accident, and by the bye, or whether really the charge and office of continuing this tradition, be not committed to some special persons, who by their duty and function ought undertake this burden, and are obliged to performe this tax.

Now being that our Lord Jesus Christ did institute an Evangelical law, and teach a Divine Doctrine of eternall salvation, which he intended should be transmitted, and conveyed to his faithful People; that is, unto all those who should believe in him, and this in a continued Series of ages without danger of change and error, to the worlds end. Which (as we have already shewed) he clearly foresaw, could not be performed by the *means* of his Disciples writings. It remains that we enquire whether he hath not appointed and ordained certain, *Ministers*, out of his providence, towards such as might believe in him in after ages, who should publish and teach this Evangelicall law, this Doctrine of, and way to eternall salvation with an uninterrupted succession from age to age until the day of doome.

This me thinks, is easily made evident to any indifferent and understanding man, in one word: for whosoever shall seriously consider the extreme frailty of man, will presently discover, that his weake and sinfull nature, would never conserve this Christian Doctrine uncorrupted, unlesse it were often and often inculcated into the hearts of the faithfull and beaten over and over again into their minds. Which to every experienced and prudent man needs no proofs, since the whole body of Christian Doctrine is for the most part, quite
opposite

It was need-
full to insti-
tute a Hierar-
chie.

opposit to sence, Nay and it promisetht only such rewards and goods, as are both spirituall and absent, and which consequently stricke mans phantasie very weakly; And therefore, do but slowly move, and stirr him up to acquire and obtain them,

It was therefore necessary, that Christ should institute a certain order of *Ministers*, who of their Duty and function should often teach this Doctrine, should frequently instruct the faithful People in the belief and practise of it; and in fine, who should be carefull, that nothing opposit unto it might be superinduced into the minds and actions of their flocks respectively committed to their charge. Wherefore that Christ hath actually instituted such an order of *Ministers*, as this which we speak of, both the necessity of the thing in it selfe, and the *infallibility* of universall tradition (which we are about to settle and demonstrate) doe most clearly evince. We call this order of *Ministers* the *Hierarchie* of the Church, which whosoever doth either refuse to accept of, or goe about to destroy, Doth no lesse then he who labours to pull down, and take away the *Magistrats*, the Judges and the keepers of the lawes, in a civill Common-wealth.

We need not examine at the present, wherein consists the right and authority of these *Ministers*, nor what is the nature and order of this *Hierarchie*. Yet is it needfull, that we declare in few words the nature of the *Church*: wherein we will not extend our enquiry (being it concernes not our present purpose any farther, then to the *Christian Church* for

The question
is only of the
Christian
Church.

for the *Synagogue of the Jewes* was wholly of another Condition : But the state of the Christian Church is of a speciall nature and quality, which only we will now handle, and that briefly.

This word *Ecclesia*, which is vsed both in the Greek and Latin Testament, and which we translate into English, *Church*, is originally a greek word, which signifies nothing else, but a compa-
what signifies
this word
Church.
 nie, an assembly, or a Congregation of men, called & selected out of a greater multitude. Whence the first Christians, who were called and selected by Christ and his Apostles, out of the great multitude of Jewes and Gentiles, were rightly named *Ecclesia* or *Church*.

This company, assembly, or Congregation thus called and collected together, was certainly to have some kind of union amongst themselves according to the Apostle, Rom. c. 12. *We are many of us one body in Christ, and every one, members one of another.* Therefore we all of us, are as it were, members of one Body, that is, of Christ, united in him, and amongst our selves. This union of Christians must necessarily Consist in that thing for which, and whereunto we are called and gathered together, that is; to performe the Evangelicall law, and thereby tread the way to eternall Salvation, insisting in the footsteps of our Master. And being (as I have often noted heretofore) that Christ intended this Congregation or Church should persist and continue to the end of the world, it was necessary that he should fix in it some certain *union of conection*, so as that the parts and members of it, being tied and strictly bound to one another,
wherein con-
sists the union
of the Church
 P might

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

might constantly subſiſt together, ſince that otherwiſe it were impoſſible ſuch a company or congregation ſhould laſt long.

This conection and conjunction of theſe parts and members one with another, ought principally to appear in their conſtant, and ſelfe ſame proſecution of the ſame thing; that is, all of them ought in their Divine beliefe, and Religious exerciſe, to obſerve the ſame things, which Chriſt had commanded to be believed and practiſed. All which (according to the common ſaying) are comprehended in the *Divine Chain of faith, and golden tye of Charity.*

What ought
to be the cauſe
of this union.

The principal cauſe of this union, in this myſticall & moral body of Chriſtians, doth chiefly ariſe (as it doth in every other ſociety, and even in civill Common-wealths) from their ſubmiſſion, and unanimous ſubjection, (after the manner of naturall bodies) to ſome ſupream head, Councel, or Authority, whereunto, when need requires, theſe members may have recourſe, and ſtick unto it. For in this conection of ſubmiſſion and ſubjection, and in this ſubordinate tye of theſe members, with this ſupream power, doth conſiſt the ſecurity and conſtant perſeverence of all ſocieties. But *every member hath not the ſame act and function* (which the Apoſtle doth ſo often inſinuate) but doth ſtand poſſeſſed of ſome ſpeciall and particular office and imployment, according to the laws and ſtatutes of each ſociety. Inſomuch, that that ſupream head, Councell, or Authority, is bound to have a care that the laws be obſerved; and indeed to provide all things and for all things. Now, he that would

Rom. 12.

goe about to take away this Authority in any civill, morall, or mysticall body or society, doth in effect labour to destroy, and hew it down to the ground; for *every kingdome, divided in its selfe, shall* Luke 11. *be destroyed,* especially when the Division is against and in relation unto the head.

It is manifest therefore, that it is not only required in this mysticall body of Christ, that all these consenting members do unanimously move, and live in the unity, and uniform profession of all things that are commanded by Christ to be believed and practised: But to the end that this sacred society may persevere and long persist in this unanimous assimilation of believe and practise, it is further necessary, that this submissive connection of these members with their head or supream power, be most faithfully and constantly observed. Which connection and subjection is of much more necessity in our Christian Church, then in any other society or Congregation whatsoever. And the reason is, because our laws are supernaturall and revealed, which can neither be known, nor conveyed by the force of naturall reason, but are only to be learnt by relation from others, and consequently are only to be received, and accepted of upon the foot of Authority.

A double union is necessary in the Church.

Hence it follows (which we have already noted) that it is not sufficient for any man to be a true and faithfull member of this Christian Congregation, that he do in any sort whatsoever participate of both these unities, I mean, that he be both like the rest in all things of believe and practise; And also that he be one of those who live in

What is not sufficient to be a member of the Church.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

submission & subjection to the supream Authority; But he must further admit and receive all that he doth believe and practise (as supernatural and Divine) because it comes and is conveyed unto him from the mouthes and speaking persons, either of Christ (as at the first,) or of his Apostles, (as immediatly after Christ) or of Christs Ministers (after them) in a continuall train of an uninterrupted tradition. Being that Christ hath instituted this means, as the sole and only way (the *Scriptures* being now excluded) of receiving and conveying his revealed Doctrine. Nor could he ordain any other means more convenient and proportionate unto human nature.

Whence it appeares (which is to be specially noted) that in our Catholick language, it is all one in effect to say, that the *Catholick Church is infallible*, and that *universal tradition is infallible*, I mean, in as much as these two things have reference to the resolution of Divine faith. For in reality we say the same thing, when we say, that the *universal tradition* of the whole Church is free from error; And when we say, that the *Catholick Church is infallible* in the tradition and delivery of her Divine and supernaturall Doctrine.

Finally therefore, the true condition of a Christian, or of a member of the Christian Church (observing the propriety of these words) requires, first, That he doe fulfill the law of the Gospell. Secondly, that he be united in the union of submission and subjection to that superior authority and Government, which Christ hath instituted. Thirdly, that this Christian society, whereof he is

What is it to
be properly a
member of
the Church.

a member, be possessed of that true and Divinely instituted means, whereby the evangelicall law may be *infallibly* known, and fulfilled. I said, *observing the propriety of these words*, that is, speaking properly and according to the ordinary and naturall course of things. For what may happen by accident, and by other wayes and means out of the common road, I will not now dispute, being not a question pertinent to this place.

Hence at length doth follow an answer to the question proposed in the beginning of this lesson, to wit ; that the Christian Church, Congregation, or society, is a company of men unanimously, professing to observe the beliefe and exercise of all things ordained by Christ to be believed and practised : As also to live united to that superior Authority and Government which Christ hath instituted : And lastly, the pastors and Rectors of this Congregation be possessed of the true means whereby all these things, which are commanded by Christ to be believed and practised, may be most certainly known without danger of error, and perfectly fulfilled.

The definition
of the
Church.

The

The first Lesson.

Wherein consists the Universal and Catholick Tradition of Christian and revealed truths.

TO what we have said in the penultime Lesson, we must yet adde divers things, which are to be supposed for the clearer understanding, and more exact resolution of this question.

What is Religion.

First, That *Religion* is a certain belief and persuasion of men in relation to some *Deity*, which we think doth guide and govern the whole course and *Series* of mans life; and by whose providence we believe divers supernatural gifts and blessings are dayly bestowed upon us; As also divers evils and punishments doe afflict us, the causes whereof we are altogether ignorant of. And it doth extend it self, even to the form and method of *Divine worship*, wherewith we hope to please and appease this *Deity*.

In every Religion there must needs be faith and hope

It is therefore manifest, that all *Religion* must needs contain *faith*, since that we beg and pray for things, whereof we know not the causes.

There must needs be likewise *hope* in all *Religion*, since we hope to obtain by the exhibition of this *Divine worship* such goods and benefits as we think we stand in need of, and which we earnestly desire.

Why Religion doth constantly persevere.

Whence it is further manifest, that *Religion* must of necessity subsist and continue with the same perseverance, and with an equal constancy, as shall

shall mankind it self. Being that the *love of good*, and the *fear of evil* are fixed and rooted in the deepest bowels of humane nature.

Hence it follows likewise, that all *Religion* doth consist in *belief* and *action*, that is, contains some things whereunto we ought to give our assents, though we do not comprehend them; and other things which doe require our external work and operation. And this is so ingrafted into the very roots of our souls, as that there can be nothing imagined more convenient, and more connatural to the rational portion of mankind.

Religion must needs contain both belief and action.

Whence it follows again, that there is no greater propension, or proclivity in humane nature, nor any thing whereof men have generally a more solicitous care, then to transfuse into their children, and convey to their posterity that *Religion* whereof themselves make profession. This, I say, is commonly the main and greatest care that Parents have to inspire and instill into their off-spring from generation to generation the *love and fear of God*, according to that form and method of *Divine worship* and service which they themselves received from their Predecessors. *How great things hath he commanded our Fathers, to make them known to their children, that another generation may know them. And the children that shall be born, and shall rise up, and shall tell their children.*

Rational nature hath a great propension to Religion.

Psalm. 77.

Secondly, it is to be noted, that the Christian and Catholick Church did never acknowledge any founder or first discoverer of revealed and divine articles of faith in the Evangelical Law, but

Christ onely the maker of articles of faith
Jesus

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

Jesus Christ himself, either teaching them with his own mouth, or by his inspired oracles the Apostles. Which we signified heretofore, when we said, that the Articles of our Catholick faith ought to rely immediatly upon Divine Revelation, that is, as their formal object. Now the Church doth not say she hath received of late, nor indeed ever since the Apostles times any revelation in relation to Catholick faith. Wherefore if we find any that sayes, the number of our revealed articles may be daily increased, we are to think that either it is the inconsiderate opinion of some private Catholicks, or the false calumny of some ignorant Heretick. As for a more plain, and more ample declaration and explication of the Articles of our faith, which we all acknowledge may be given by the Church upon just occasion, we shall hereafter shew how that is true.

That there are
Ministers and
Pastors in the
Church.

Thirdly, is to be noted (which we have proved in the last Lesson) that Christ himself hath instituted in the Christian Church certain *Ministers, Pastors, and Preachers*, who are to continue in an uninterrupted succession to the worlds end, whose office and function is to publish and preach the revealed truths of Christian doctrine, and the Gospel of the new Law, to instruct their faithful people in it, and according to it, to perswade, and *exhort in our Lord*, that they *walk uprightly in that grace in which they are called*, and that they doe persevere therein, fulfilling both in belief and practise that Law which they have embraced.

Fourthly, it is to be noted, that the way and method by which the Gospel, or Christs revealed

ed doctrine was first preached and settled, was a very special and particular one. For after that Jesus Christ had preached and planted his Gospel by the most holy and efficacious meanes that possibly could be imagined, had watred it with his own precious blood; had signed it, as it were, with his bitter death and passion, being his last Will and Testament, and finally sent from heaven, joyntly with his eternal Father their holy Spirit into his Apostles and Disciples, delegating these heavenly messengers diffusedly to the vast world, dispersing and separating them into all the parts of it. This done, these Divine Ambassadors spent a full sufficient time (which St. Paul remarks to have been *three yeares*) in every Church and City for the planting and settling of Christian faith and Evangelical doctrine in the hearts of their Profelytes and Neophytes. And this they did confirm with innumerable and most pregnant miracles, with most ardent and zealous exhortations, their teares flowing from the fervour of their spirits, thus labouring therein day and night. Insomuch that they did no lesse clearly convince the understandings, then vehemently enflame the wills of their disciples and auditors. So that no man can doubt but that this doctrine was most firmly established in these three years space, especially being that the faithful did settle in their hearts, by their dayly exercise & continual practise, that which they were evinced to believe. And hence they grew so learned, and so perswaded in all things of Faith & Religion, that they did most certainly believe it

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

was altogether necessary for the obtaining of their eternal salvation, that they ought to adhere, and never to renounce the truth of this Gospel. This work of preaching and setting the Gospel, was performed at the same time in many and several parts and regions of the world, far distant from each other, without book or writing (except among the *Jewes*, with whom the Authority of the Old Testament was Canonical, and therefore was alledged and pressed in formal words against them) whereof not any Countrey or Nation knew at the first that the same Gospel was preached elsewhere. Nor had these far distant Nations any such commerce or intelligence with each other, as whereby they might complot together, and contrive to make any union or concord in order to profess the same Faith, and practise the same Religion. But every Church in every Kingdome or Nation (far remote, I say, from one another) did embrace in belief, and practise in action, that Divine doctrine and discipline which they heard preached unto them. This I conceive is most necessary to be noted, being the first foundation and corner-stone of that *universal tradition*, which we take to be the sole and final rule of our Christian Faith, in relation to us.

How union
was necessary
in the Church
in its founda-
tion.

Fifthly, we may note, that the Catholick Church thus constituted by Christ, being to last to the end of the world, it was needful (as we have already shewed) that there should be such an unity and uniformity in it, as that it might be still conserved entire and uncorrupted, at least in its
substance

substance or *essence*. Wherefore (as I then concluded) it was likewise needful, that the Divine Founder of this Evangelical Law should provide some meanes whereby at least the *principal* and most necessary points of belief and practise might be certainly known, and duely observed. Further, we also there demonstrated, that neither the holy Scripture, nor humane ratiocination, nor the private Spirit, can serve the Christian Church for such a meanes. It remaineth therefore, that we examine the nature of *universal tradition*, and see whether our Christian & Catholick Faith may safely and without danger of error rely upon it. For if it once appear, that the Catholick Church doth now, and ever did rely upon this principle in her belief of all revealed tenets: And that it appear also, that this tradition is a faithful means, and free from all error, it will follow most clearly, that whatsoever is universally believed by all Catholicks upon this tenure, is not onely true, but is likewise a thing most certainly revealed.

Now it is a thing known to every one, that all Catholicks doe hold it for a most certain *maxime*, that nothing ought or can be maintained as a revealed and Christian truth, but what we have received from our forefathers, and what hath been so delivered from hand to hand, and from ear to ear, in a continuall *Series* of succession from the Apostles. And that whatsoever is not thus delivered, and conveyed unto us under this title and *tenure* from age to age, is not of *Divine right*, nor consequently, is not immutable. And that this

A Catholike
axiome of the
tenure of faith.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

maxime and Catholick Dogme, was ever held by the Church to be the onely meanes of transmitting and conveying all revealed tenets; and that also this maxime could never begin anew in any age since the Apostles, is most evident. For the Catholicks receiving all other Christian and revealed tenets from their fore-fathers, could not forge this onely principle anew, being the rule of all the rest. For as soon as Christian doctrine began to be preached by those who did immediately succeed the Apostles and their disciples, they must of necessity have delivered it under this title and *tenure*, to wit, as having received it from their immediate fore-fathers; and for this reason did believe it, because they received it so.

Things revealed, & things things of Ecclesiastical constitution have overbeen delivered by the Church promiscuously & indistinctly.

Now whereas we never heard that the Church, in the delivery and conveyance of her doctrine, did ever compose or set forth any catalogue of her revealed Articles, and Divine Institutions, by which her revealed tenets of faith might be distinctly known from the rest of her doctrine (whether of Ecclesiastical Institution, or any other not immediately relying upon Divine revelation) but did alwayes teach and deliver her tenets of both these kinds conjoynly together, according as they belonged to the same subject, as best befitted the method of Catechisms: Hence I say, it must necessarily follow, that the Church in what age soever you look upon her, did still goe upon this same principle, did still observe this order, and did still proceed upon this *tenure* in delivering of her Divine doctrine, to wit,

wit, that nothing at all was to be held as a revealed article of Divine faith but what was communicated and delivered unto her by her immediate forefathers upon this same ground and *tenure*. So that indeed it is impossible the Catholick Church should ever have begun anew, either to deliver, or to receive her revealed doctrine upon this *tenure*, but must needs have had this principle from the beginning, that is, it must necessarily have been deduced in a continued *Series* from the age immediatly following the disciples of the Apostles.

Further, not onely the perpetual custome of the Church, but even the holy Scriptures doe testifie most clearly, that universal tradition was instituted and left by Christ himself as the means whereby all revealed articles were to be delivered from age to age to his faithful people. The places which testifie both parts of this assertion, are commonly cited by Divines. Take here two or three out of St. Paul, Cor. 11. *I have received of our Lord what I delivered unto you.* 2 Tim. 2. *Keep the traditions which you have learnt, whether by word of mouth, or by our Epistle.* 1 Tim. 6. *What you have heard from me before many witnesses, these recommend to the faithful people.* 2 Tim. 1. *Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me.* The same hath been taught in every age by the Fathers and Pastors of the Church. Saint Cyril in his Epistle which is inserted into the acts of the Councel of Ephesus, hath these words: *Nor is it sufficient to thy Religion that thou dost onely profess the symbole of Faith or Creed, &c. but thou oughtst also*

Proofs out of
Scripture that
Christian doctrine
is to be delivered
by
tradition.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

also to acknowledge with oath, that thou dost anathematize thy filthy and profane dogmes; that thou dost teach, and hast the same sentiments which all we Bishops, Maisters, and Teachers of the people, as well through the East as the West, doe believe and teach. The same doth Pope John 2. in his second Epistle to Justinian the Emperour, praying his faith, say, *You do constantly, and inviolately keep, with a devout and pious mind, that one, true, and Catholick faith, which our Lord instituted by the instruction of Jesus Christ, spread all the world over by the preaching of the Prophets, and Apostles, confirmed by the confession of the Saints, united in the belief of all the Fathers, and Doctors, and conform to our doctrine, and to the doctrine of the whole present Church.*

It were easy to shew, that this universall tradition perpetuated in a continuall line, hath ever been held the onely rule of faith in relation to us, and the onely means whereby revealed tenets are to be conveyed to the whole Church, and so transmitted from age to age. This I say, I could easily shew by many plain testimonies of the holy Councils, and ancient fathers, which for brevity sake I willingly omit.

The tenure of
tradition is
proved to be
infallible.

It now remaineth that we demonstrate this *universall tradition*, whereupon we see the Church doth rely in her beliefe of her revealed tenets, to be an *infallible* means of conveying them from age to age without error. Thus then supposing this to be the principle, upon which Catholicks proceed and depend in their Divine faith; It doth evidently follow, first on the one part, that Catholicks could not, all of them universally (in what

what age soever) dispersed through so many nations far distant one from another, all of them, I say, be deceived in such things as they had so often heard, and in which they had been bred and brought up; so deceived, I say, as to think any thing to be delivered unto them by their immediate forefathers, and receive it as a revealed tenet, which was never taught them, nor delivered unto them as such. Secondly, on the other part, it is likewise, impossible, that the Catholik Bishops and Pastors of any age, and the parents of all particular families, should all of them universally dispersed into so many Kingdoms and Regions of the world, teach and deliver unto their Disciples and Children any point or position of doctrine or practise, under the title of a revealed and Divine article, which they themselves had not received under the same *tenure*. Wherefore, being both these parts are true and manifest in relation to every age, it evidently follows, that no article of Christian Doctrine can be either *universally* delivered, or *universally* received as a revealed and Divine tenet, which is not truly such. Much less is it possible, that an error opposite to any article universally received by the Church, under the notion of a revealed and Divine tenet, should be brought in upon this selfe same title, and under this self same notion. Especially, since there cannot be assigned any time, any place, or any circumstance of the first beginning of such errors as the hereticks pretend against us. It remains therefore clear, and without doubt, that no tenet of Christian Doctrine, either could or did in any
age

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

age be taught, & delivered throughout the whole Church as a supernatural and revealed article, which in the age immediatly before was not taught and believed to be of the same nature and condition.

An example
of the proof.

Let us cleare this further with an example ; In the year of our Saviour Jesus Christ 1500. the whole Catholick Church did universally professe, that the true and real Body of Christ, was offered in the sacrifice of the Mass ; And this I say, was taught and preached all the world over as a Christian and revealed Article ; yea, and this principally upon this ground, because it was universally transmitted and delivered unto them by their immediat forefathers in the year 1400. under this title and tenure. Although they did believe the truth of the position for the authority of Christ, who first revealed it. Although, I say, this Divine authority was the formall motive of their faith, yet was the universall tradition of their immediate forefathers, the only *infallible* means by which that authority was conveyed unto them. this supposed, it is more then manifest, that the Catholick Church in the age 1500. could not possibly then, first begin to hold and teach this article of Christian Doctrine, as a revealed and Divine tenet, being she did universally profess at the same time, that she neither ought, nor could receive and acknowledge, either this or any other Article whatsoever, as a revealed and Divine one, unlesse it were taught and delivered unto her, by her immediate forefathers, under this same title and tenure. Nay, and even those
her

her immediate forefathers, who delivered this article unto her as revealed and Divine, did likewise profels and testific, that they themselves had received the selfe same article, under the selfe same tenure. And in like manner we may discourse of every revealed article of our Christian faith, ascending from age to age to the Apostles times; which we shall more clearly and fully shew in the subsequent lesson. In which we will also answer to some few slight objections which our adversaries do urge against us.

The fourth Lesson.

Wherein consists chiefly the infallibility of the universall tradition of revealed truth? And whence it is that no error in faith can be introduced universally into the Catholick Church?

Although, what we have already said in the precedent lesson, doth seem to establish sufficiently the solidity and *infallibility* of universall tradition; yet, I conceive it not unfit, to add thereunto some further light, whereby it may be more plain and evident.

First, that there may be no deceit in the equivocall signification of words, we must distinguish a threefold tradition of sacred things in our Christian Religion. The first is *Divine*. The second is *Apostolicall*. The third *Ecclesiasticall*.

Three sorts of
sacred Tradition.

That we call *Divine*, which doth contain some point of revealed Doctrine, or some sacred action of Divine worship, which the Catholick

R Church

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

Church did ever believe to have been taught, or instituted by Christ. That we call *Apostolicall*, which is a tradition of any such thing as the universall Church doth hold not to have had its beginning either from Council or Pope, but hath ever and every where been in force, since the time of the Apostles. Lastly, that we call *Ecclesiasticall* which is a tradition of any thing either belonging to Divine worship or Ecclesiasticall Discipline, which the Church doth know to have been instituted, either by some Council, or by some Pope.

Such things as be of the first *tradition*, are altogether immutable; for since it belongs to the same authority to abrogate a law, to whom it belongs to enact it, it follows, that such things as Christ hath taught and ordained, he only can change them, and make them void.

Such things as be of the second sort of tradition, that is, of only *Apostolicall* institution, without any exprefs and known command of Christ, may be changed and made void by the universall Church; which I suppose the hereticks themselves will not deny, particularly concerning the Apostolicall precept of *abstaining from stified meats and blood*.

Lastly, such things as be of the third sort of tradition, it is without Dispute, that the same authority may, if occasion serve, take them away as well as it hath ordained them. Of this the giving of the Eucharist to Children; The giving of it to lay-people in both kinds. Both which, although they were in use in divers Churches,

yea, and perhaps, even in the Apostels time; yet certain it is, that neither were they universally practised, nor ever did the Bishops and Pastors of the Church, *universally* teach or acknowledge them to be of *necessity* by any commandement of Christ.

Hence it is manifest, that *Divine* tradition (*the infallibility* whereof we now endeavour to evince) doth require, or rather hath inseperably annexed unto it, three conditions: *Antiquity, universality,* and *consentment*. In so much that what ever we affirm to be conveyed unto us by *Divine* tradition, it must of necessity be accompanied with these three qualities. Whence I wonder, how hereticks dare make any doubt of the certainty of *universal tradition*; Being the most part, and wisest of them, are forced to confesse, that there is no other certain and *infallible* ground, whereupon to build the truth of the chiefe Articles of our Christian Religion; for example, whether the book, which we call the *Bible*, be truly the Word of God? Which is the true sence and meaning of the holy Scripture? Whether the Symbole of the Apostles, commonly called the Apostles Creed was certainly made by the Apostles? Whether it be a sufficient abridgement of our Christian faith? Whether there be truly in the self same and singular substance of the Deity, three distinct persons? Whether the father be unbegotten? Whether the son be consubstantiall to the father? Whether the holy Ghost doth proceed from both of them? Whether there be two unmixed natures in Christ? Whether two wills? Whether Christ

Divine tradition hath inseperably annexed unto it three conditions.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

descending to hel did thence deliver the prophets and Fathers of the ancient Testament? Whether the B. Virgin was truly the Mother of Christ? Whether she was alwayes a Virgin? Whether any, or what number of Sacraments? Whether instituted by Christ? What is their matter? What their form? What their effects? Whether Children ought to be baptised before they come to the use of reason? These and many such like tenets are maintained by divers hereticks as arricles of Christian faith, wherof they themselves acknowledge, there can be had no other true and *rationall certainty*, then what *universall tradition* can guide us?

The chief
ground of the
certainty of
tradition.

The first root and principall foundation both of Tradition and of its certainty, we have declared to be the universall, and solicitous teaching and preaching of Christian Doctrine, even at the first beginning of it; that is, By the Apostles themselves in divers parts of the world far distant from each other, preaching and teaching the self same Doctrine, and at the self same time, inculcating it every where, over and over again, into the hearts of their Disciples for divers years together, and making them confirm it by their day'y actions and practice: And this, a Doctrine belonging to Religion, and mainly concerning their eternall salvation. And consequently, the perseverance whereof, doth rely upon the whole force of nature, as being a thing most convenient, and connaturall to mankind, to be conveyed and delivered from father to son, and from generation to generation.

This

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

125

This Doctrine is likewise supported and sustained by Gods special providence, by the promises of Jesus Christ, and by the efficacious power of the holy Ghost sent particularly from heaven to this effect. The *infallibility* therefore of this *Divine tradition* is manifest, both from the nature of tradition it selfe, and from its universality, as we have shewed in the last lesson. But that we may yet make it more clear and evident, we will suppose an example: A Christian Apostata, in any age whatsoever, starts up and dares preach and publish some new thing, as, that such, or such a Catholick article is contrary to the revealed truth and Doctrine of Jesus Christ (for heresies are generally negative propositions, and consequently of a malignant qualitie,) to wit, that the *Mass is abomination*. This rebell certainly cannot say that he received this negative assertion from the Bishops and Pastors who were his immediate forefathers, as a supernaturall & revealed Doctrine (which we have shewed to be the sole & only *means*, whereby all Christian truths are delivered and received by the Catholick Church as *revealed*) no, nor can he say, that he ever heard any such thing reported by them. For being we suppose, that it doth belong to the *Essence* of every Article of our Divine and Catholick faith, that it be delivered and received by the universall Church under this title and tenure; It is manifest, that all the Christians, both of the same Nation and Church, wherein this Apostata should dwell, and all other Nations, and Churches throughout the world would oppose him, and witnesse this assertion to be a most impu-

A main confirmation of the certainty of tradition.

An example of the impossibility of error in divine faith.

impudent lye; since that they themselves never received, nor heard of any such position before. Yea, they would say with the Apostle: *We have no such Doctrine nor custome, no nor the Church of God.* So that when an Innovator shall dare affirm any such thing; he alone, (all the whole Christian world crying out against him,) must sustain this most evident and most impudent untruth. What must therefore such an Arch-heretick do? pretend *tradition*? No, but he must say, that this pretended error, or abuse, did creep by little and little into the Church, but contrary to holy Scriptures, and to the practise of the primitive times. Wherefore the Catholicke Church insisting and relying still upon this principle, that no position is either to be delivered or received, as an Article of Divine faith, and revealed truth, which hath not been *universally* conveyed from the Apostles times in a continued succession, from hand to hand, and from generation to generation; This principle, I say, standing good, it is impossible that the *universall tradition* of the Catholick church should be subject to error.

A confirmation of the infallibility of tradition.

The *infallibility* of this Tradition is likewise mainly strengthened and confirmed in this, that all these revealed truths of faith doe either immediately and directly consist in action and practise, or at least have a necessary and *essentiall* relation to some principall exercise of Religion. Whereupon the lives, actions, and practises of Christians, acting as Christians, doe give a continuall testimony of their beliefe, and thereby confirm it; yea, and both infer, and in some sort produce

produce, the unity of faith amongst Christians ; being all the chief practises of Christian Religion, and Divine worship, are found to be every where the same.

For example, in the beginning of *Luthers Heresie* , no man will deny but that the whole Church did universally believe the true and real body of Christ to be in the Sacrament of the Altar, and to be dayly offered by Priests in the Sacrifice of the Masse for the expiation of sinnes; whilst, I say, all Christians did universally every week or day assist at this sacrifice, and did offer it together with the Priest, and did receive the holy Communion during the time of this sacrifice, and did adore the sacred body and blood of Christ, and did pray unto Jesus Christ, as truly and really contained under the visible *species*, and elements which they saw; and in fine did practise these and other such like acts of Religion and Piety; it must necessarily follow, that they did both testifie and confirm their faith in this point. Which self-same thing being universally done elsewhere, it must needs make the unity of the Catholick Faith to be most certain and invincible.

(An example of this confirmation.

This *infallible* certainty of universal tradition may be yet further corroborated, in that our revealed doctrine was at the very first not onely taught, but even settled and engrafted in many and several Nations, as well Monarchies as Common-wealths. Whereby it is manifest, that not any one capital article of it could perish in all these Nations at the same time. For it will appear

The infallibility of universal tradition is farther confirmed.

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

pear most evident to whomsoever shall consider seriously the businessse, that the same reason for which this revealed doctrine might perhaps be destroyed in some one Kingdome or Countrey, would cause it to encrease and flourish in another. For, if we sadly weigh the conditions and circumstances of places, times, and persons, by which Christian Religion doth now and then decay, or is destroyed in some one Kingdome or Countrey, we shall find that the self-same reasons and motives will produce the quite contrary effect elsewhere, and will cause the self-same doctrine, even in opposition and hatred to those that would pull it down, to shine more cleare, and appear more glorious. Every one knowes that some of the Princes of *Germany*, favourers of the French Faction, and affected to *Lutheran*-liberty and heresie, did then contribute very much to the destruction of the Catholick Faith in those parts, whilst at the same time there were divers others, who both in hatred to *Luther*, and to side with the Spanish party, did labour much to the settling and propagating of the Catholick doctrine. Whence it is evidently impossible, that there should be any cause so universal, and so powerfully diffused into all places and in all ages, so constantly perseverant, and so actually efficacious, as should absolutely destroy, and totally overwhelm any revealed truth of our Christian doctrine, in such sort as there should remain no memory of it.

What prudent man would imagine this could happen in any particular *Species*, or kind of either

vegetal or sensible things, as of any kind of birds or beasts, which being once multiplied and universally settled all the world over, should possibly finde its opposite contrarieties so generally powerful in time, place, and other necessary circumstances, as to be able to cause its total destruction and entire ruine. Much lesse can the same betal any revealed article of Christian Religion. And if at any time such a destruction of Religion doe fall out in some one Province or Nation, it doth last only for a time, that is, until the seeds of those revealed truths which were sowed in the hearts of men, do spring and flourish again. This we conceive to be true in respect of our Christian Religion, much rather then of any thing else whatsoever; it being that which the Author both of nature and grace did principally intend, did plant with his own hand, did water with his own blood, and did ordain as the immediate end for which all things were created.

Some may now perhaps curiously enquire, whether it be evident out of what we have said, why our Christian faith hath hitherto never failed or perished. Of whom, if I should ask whether he can tell me the reason why the world hath lasted thus long; why mankind had not been extinguished long ago; I believe it would not be easie for him to satisfie me with an evident demonstration: yet I doe verily think it is most evident out of the principles which I have laid, that Christian Faith and Religion, neither hath perished, nor can perish but with mankind. Let but him that

An objection
answered.

What was to
be done a-
gainst an In-
novator in the
time of the
Apostles.

doubts of this, consider (which cannot be too often repeated) with what labour, paines, and diligence the Doctrine of Christ was preached, and promulgated by his Apostles at the same time, and in so many several parts of the world, how often reiterated, how solicitously explicated, insomuch that every Neophit knew exactly what was to be believed, and what was to be practised, according to the precepts of this Divine Doctrine. Let him consider with how much zeal and fervour of spirit every Profelyte was *admonished even with tears*, as the Apostle saith. So that, if in the time of the Apostles, or of their immediate successors, there had risen any false Prophet (as there did) who was perceived to sow some new Doctrine, either negative or affirmative (drawing after him several disciples) which he pretended to prove either by reason, or by the authority of the holy Scriptures, it was easy for them to gather themselves together into some place (which the sacred Text doth assure us was done by the Apostles at *Hierusalem*) and there to examine the point in question, which as soon as ever they perceived not to be any Article known unto them, as either necessary to be believed or practised, they presently concluded it was to be condemned and anathematized. Nor was it any lesse easie for the Disciples of the Apostles to discern the like doctrine. For unlesse such a position or practise was the same in substance with what they themselves professed, and in which they were expert both in believe and practise, they certainly knew it was to be rejected.

sted. Nor could the captious arguments, and slight sophisms of such an Innovator any whit trouble their minds, being certain that thesetwo things were all one to them, to wit, for this Innovators position to be new and false, and for it not to be delivered unto them by the Apostles. Because, whatsoever might be super-added to the Doctrine of the Apostles, as consonant thereunto, ought not to beget a *Schism*; since that no true Christian ever doubted but that every one ought to obey and stand to the judgment of the supream Tribunal of the Church, being taught, that who should resist, and not obey her, *was to be esteemed as heathen and publican.* Matth. 18. And I think it doth sufficiently appear out of the principles which we have already settled, that the Catholick Church hath always used from age to age upon immergent occasions the selfsame rule.

But you will ask, why may we not say, that some error, even in a main point of Religion, may at least tacitly creep into the Church? No, nor this cannot happen. First, certainly it cannot happen from a pure ignorance of Christian Doctrine; that is, so as such a capital article should come to be quite forgotten; I mean, so as that all the members of the Catholick Church and Society should come to be wholly ignorant of such an article, through a total oblivion of it; which the reasons we have already alledged, doe most clearly evince. Likewise, that such an error opposite to a revealed article of our Catholick faith cannot be introduced universally throughout the

Why an error cannot be brought into the Church.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

True faith
cannot be
changed nei-
ther by reason
nor by autho-
rity.

whole Church, is no lesse certain. For the change of any common opinion must needs proceed either from the evidence of such reasons and arguments as are truly stronger then any that can be brought for it; or from the power and violence of some Superiour Authority. I say, *truly stronger*, because I speak in relation to a great and vast multitude of men, dispersed into several Nations and Kingdomes, as we shall presently declare.

Not by reason

The first is impossible, since that no arguments against the truth can be *truly stronger* then those that may be brought in favour of it. And surely, fallacious and slight ratiocinations can never prevail universally with all the world. Wherefore, it is not onely a vain, but an impudent boasting of our Hereticks to say, that the whole Catholick Church may be clearly evinced of most manifest errors by the holy Scriptures. For this is as much as to say in effect, that all the Catholikes throughout the world are either quite stupid and senselesse, or most impertinently wilful and perverse, being all of them are stark blind in so clear a light. Which seemes to me too wild an extravagance for any rational man to say it, to wit, That amongst so many millions of men, of whom there be likewise so many pious and learned, there should none be found of an ordinary understanding, and indifferent moderation.

Not by au-
thority.

The second is also *impossible*, to wit, that there should be any force and violence, at whose disposal all punishments and rewards should be, which
should

should be so universally diffused in time and places, as it should be able to take quite away, and abolish all knowledge and memory of the true Religion. Let us suppose an Authority or power the greatest that can be imagined; let this power use all possible meanes and endeavours to destroy the true Faith and Religion. First, all the Sophisms which might be brought to this effect, would be in vain; for there would be still found so many learned and skilful men dispersed in several Nations of the Christian world, who are continually watchful over *Solomons bed*, that is, careful to preserve whole and entire the faith of the Church and Religion, as would be able with small labour to discover and dissolve the fraudulent arguments of such an Innovator. And this the more easily, in that all revealed truth is not to be proved and shewed by reason, but by tradition. Nor is there any thing else to be enquired in any controversie of Religion against an Innovator, but onely whether the doctrine which he labours to introduce was delivered unto him; by his immediate fore fathers.

Further it cannot be imagined that there should be found any force and violence, so armed with all kinde of conditions and circumstances, as that it should be able to produce such a prodigious effect throughout the whole world. For first we must suppose it to be Master of all the Christian world, which is scarcely imaginable. Secondly, ought it not to fear rebellion from its jurisdiction? Thirdly, would this im-
pious

pious and vehement passion of desire to extirpate a true Religion, and establish a false, continue for ever; Fourthly, would this power find every where, faithful Ministers and instruments for such a purpose? And lastly, suppose it had this effect (which is impossible) would there not remain a memory how this new error was introduced? And this violence ceasing, would not free men, and such as feared God, return to the true faith and Religion: Whosoever will seriously consider and penetrate to the bottom, the principles of reason in this case, shall evidently perceive that great and largely-extended multitudes of men can never be universally brought either by hope or fear to give their common consent to a manifest untruth.

Why mens
perswasion of
a revealed
truth cannot
easily be turned
into a
contrary be-
liefe.

If we yet enquire further, what time may be required to the end that the Catholick and generall perswasion of men in a truth, may come to be changed into a common consent to a falsehood; so as that, this erroneous belief may pass for a truth received by tradition. To this effect it were needful, that the truth which was in vigor, should be quite buried in oblivion; so that no man should be able to remember that ever he heard say, that such a truth was in force amongst men, either in belief, or practise. For as long as it may be known (though onely by heresie) that there was a former belief (which we now suppose is abolished) which was ancients than this which we would now establish, this latter surely can never be esteemed nor pass for a truth of *universal tradition*, that is, delivered from hand

to

to hand from the times of the Apostles untill this day, by an universall succession. And whosoever will make a particular calculation of any truth universally known and received shall certainly finde, that this could not be done in six hundred years. And truly it is impossible, that any violence should perseverantly possesse, or rather oppress the whole Christian world so many years together in dispight of nature and evident reason.

There be three things therefore which do withstand this monstrous effect. First, that there is no authority or power imaginable which can produce it; for although a truth coming from one man only may of its own nature spread it self through all mankind; yet we know by experience, that falshood must be brought in, at least amongst the wiser sort of men, either by force or by interest. Secondly, by reason the immutable constancy of universall causes, cannot admit such a prodigious defectuosity in the whole fabrik of nature. Any particular cause may and can swarve from its proper effect; but that all causes universally should be deficient, and all at once, were as much as if nature it self should perish. Thirdly, The constancy of Religion, and the *infallibility* of tradition, which we have already explicated, can never suffer such an effect to be universally produced. Now all this which we have said and demonstrated of the immutability of an universall Religion in common, may be applied to every capital article of our revealed doctrine and Divine practice, as of Baptism, of the
Mass,

Three things
do hinder an
universall
change in
Religion.

Whether an
error may
not creep ta-
citly into the
Church.

Mafs, of the Eucharist, and the like.

Finally, we will consider, whether there may not be introduced, at least, as it were, by stealth, and at unawares, into the universal Church, some new Doctrine of faith, or sacred practise in Religion, as of Divine institution, under the *tenure* of being delivered and received as such, by *universal tradition*. Whereunto the answer is ready and evident, supposing that we have shewed, and proved already. For since that all things which are of Divine faith, and of universal tradition, cannot be learnt or known by any other means, or under any other title, then by relation or report. And such things as are so universally related and reported (especially if they consist in any external action, as all our Christian tenets do) may be most certainly known in any age by our external senses to have descended unto us for above a 100. years. For the men of any one age whatsoever, may certainly know, that they have heard such a thing reported and related unto them, (especially when it is a thing which they see in daily use and practise) that it is a tradition of a 100. years. Yea, and they may also certainly know, that those of whom they heard it, did likewise certify them, that they knew it, as having descended unto them by tradition of a 100 years before them.

The same
truth is fur-
ther proved.

To the end therefore, that any new article of faith, or practise of Religion be brought into the Church as of Divine institution, it must have been divulged at least for the space of one age; which certainly is impossible to be done tacitly, and by stealth; for to say that any new Doctrine

in faith, or new worship in Religion, can be brought into any one Nation, much lesse into the universal Church without being taken notice of by any body, is a most ridiculous imagination ; much lesse, that it should be brought in as a revealed truth, or as of Divine institution ; and consequently, that the knowledge and memory of the contrary doctrine or practise, should be quite forgotten. As though forsooth, any alteration in Religion, or any change in Divine worship though of the least consideration, could be introduced without being perceived, whilst every particular congregation doth every day, and every where, hear and see what is done in their Churches. This were to suppose the most efficacious causes of admiration without any effect ; whilst in the mean time nothing at all, no not the least ceremonie, which we see and hear to have been changed, or superadded in our Divine culte, but all learned and skilful men do perfectly and exactly know, yea and it is publicly noted and registred, when, at what place, and by what person it was first begun. Wherefore no man that understands the nature of Religion, or hath examined the publick and universal practise of Divine worship, will ever say, that any error or change, can be introduced into the universal and Catholick Church, without being taken notice of.

The nature and condition of our Christian Discipline, and of our Catholick Doctrine, is much more immutable, and further from all change, then any other Discipline whatsoever;

The same truth is shewed from the discipline of the Church.

T

for

for the order and method of it, is to hold fast, and, as it were, bound up together all its parts, so as if the least portion of it fail, the whole body of it falls presently to the ground. As Philosophers say of the chain of moral vertues, and Divines professe of keeping the Decalogue, who bring St. James for witnesse, saying, *Who sinneth in one thing, is become guilty of all.* For example, *Arrius* by denying of Christs Divinity, took away the belief of the Trinity, destroyed the mystery of the Incarnation, abrogated Baptism, and in fine, made void all the Common prayers of the Church; and thereby did not onely disjoynt, but even annul the Divine cult of Christian Religion.

Jac. 2.

Destroy tradition, and you destroy faith.

It is therefore evident, that no tenet can be brought into the Church as a revealed article, without breaking the order and nature of *tradition*; which, since we see it is the rule of our faith in relation to us, no man can doubt but that the ruine of our faith must thence necessarily follow. Whence we find that all heresies from small beginnings (if any thing may be called *small* in matter of Religion) are used to break out into great divisions, and into innumerable errors.

An objection answered.

But why may not (saith an Heretick) something which is onely of Ecclesiastical Institution, passe into, and be had for a revealed truth? for Christian Doctrine is without distinction promiscuously taught, that is, revealed Doctrine, and things of Divine Institution, are delivered together with such things as are onely of Ecclesiastical

cal precept. Truly it matters not much what we answer to this objection, if the question be onely in relation to the ignorant people. For so the things be true which they are taught, and which are delivered unto them by tradition (and we have shewed that universal tradition doth not admit of any such error) it imports much in relation onely to the faithful people, whether such things be distinguished or no. It is sufficient that these things are discerned by *Divines*, and by the *Pastors* of the Church: And there is nothing decreed or instituted by the Church, which is not exactly known to all skilful and learned *Pastors*, by whom, where, and for what cause such a thing was first ordained and appointed.

The fifth Lesson.

Wherein doth the Universal Tradition of revealed truths differ from the universal tradition of humane truths? And whether the foundation whereupon the perseverance of Christian faith is grounded, is more strong then the principles of the continuance of humane nature?

Of what we have said, it doth clearly appear, that there are many disparities and differences betwixt *Divine* and *Humane* Tradition. For although (as we have heretofore demonstrated) there be certain humane traditions so *universal* both in time and place, that no wise man can doubt of the truth of those things which

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

are delivered ; yet we shall now make it manifest, that the nature of *Divine* tradition is not onely different from, and of another kind then humane tradition, but also that its *certainly* doth excel, and is far stronger then the certainty of any *humane tradition* whatsoever.

The first disparity between Divine and humane tradition.

First, it is clear that there neither is, nor ever was any tradition of any humane truth, I mean purely *humane*, which hath been so largely extended through all the world, as is, and hath been the tradition of our Christian Faith. There is no Nation in the world, no part of this terrestrial globe, no Province, nay almost no City, but at one time or other hath heard of our Christian faith, and learnt something of our revealed truths. *Their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.* And being the universality and latitude of tradition is the principal and greatest cause of its strength and certainty (as we have shewed in the precedent Lesson) it doth surely follow, that *Divine* and Christian tradition doth much surpass all *humane* tradition.

Rom. 10.

The second disparity.

Secondly, There was never any *humane* tradition of any truth whatsoever, which, lest it should fail, had appointed Officers and Ministers dispersed throughout all the world into the several societies of civil Common-wealths, designed, I say, to the greatest Kingdoms, Cities, and Townes, nay, to every little Village and Hamlet, who by their office and function were to deliver, teach, and explicate that truth which was to be conveyed by that Tradition; nor this to be

be inculcated into every particular mans heart and foul, even from his infancy and childhood, to the laft period of his life. Nay further, that thefe Officers might perform their duty more happily and eafily, that they were endowed with fo much and fuch heavenly power, and with fuch Divine prerogatives and priviledges, as that they might without difficulty perfwade their people and fubjects unto fuch truths as they were to teach and deliver; and which by that meanes their fubjects did more willingly embrace with religious piety and great veneration. All thefe things are proper and peculiar to our *tradition* of revealed truths. Whereas every *humane tradition*, though never fo certain, is transmitted and conveyed from hand to hand, as it were, by chance or upon occafion, without any prefcribed method or order, either in writing, or by word of mouth.

Thirdly, There is no *tradition* of any truth which is purely *humane*, for the conftant perfeverance whercof, and for the greater ftability of its belief we ever heard there were ordained any dayly praftife or frequent exercife whereby, I fay, to confirm its duration. But the *tradition* of our revealed truths, is not onely transmitted by the publishing and preaching of them in the eares of Chriftians, with dayly Catechifms and exhortations, but is even engrafted and fetled in their hearts by their dayly praftife and continual exercife of what they believe. For example, this revealed truth is to be conveyed by *tradition*; that Baptifm was instituted, and commanded by
Chrift

The third
difparity.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

Christ to be administred to all Christians for the extirpation of original sin. Now who doth not see that whilst by an interrupted continuation from day to day, from year to year, and from age to age, the Officers and Ministers of the Church, delegated and diffused throughout the whole Christian world, every one in his own Congregation or Church, publicly and frequently teaching this revealed doctrine to have been instituted and commanded by Christ, and at the same time exercising this self-same truth by their daily administration of Baptism to their subjects; who, I say, doth not see how much this practise doth settle and corroborate the constancy and stability of this *tradition*? How far are all traditions of humane things short of this, through the want of this onely support? And what we say of this particular article amongst all our revealed truths, may be applyed and made common to the rest; since the nature and method of this tradition is the same in order to all the revealed Articles of our Christian faith.

The fourth
disparity.

Fourthly, There is no stronger, nor more efficacious principle and ground whereby the memory of any truth may be imprinted into the hearts of men, and continue there by *tradition*, then when men find themselves generally swayed by a powerful bent of a natural inclination to the thing that is to be delivered by such a *tradition*. Now it is certain, that the desire of eternal salvation, and the fear of everlasting punishment, are most deeply rooted in the soules of men, especially of Christians; who, since they generally be-

believe that Religion (whatever it be) or Divine worship is the way & means whereby they are to attain to the height of beatitude, and to be freed from the depth of damnation, it cannot be imagined that there is any thing which the rational *Will* of man doth either more naturally embrace, or more earnestly desire to compasse. So that indeed there is nothing which men, though but indifferently rational, and not altogether irreligious, doth with more fervour and diligence (as we have already noted) labour to plant both in themselves, and in their posterity. Whence there doth appear a main disparity betwixt *Divine* and *Humane Tradition*. For amongst all *humane traditions*, there is not any which doth so concern mankind, as that it is not indifferent to the most part of men whether they know the thing that is conveyed by such a *tradition* or no. I will not deny, but that it may perhaps be requisite to some learned and civilized men, as an ornament of honour and *bonne-grace* in the world, yea and useful too in some occasions, to know such humane affaires as are conveyed by *tradition*; but that any such thing is essentially necessary to humane nature in genera^l, so as that all men are concerned in it, as they are in Religion, and in the knowledge of revealed truths, no man, I believe, will say it. In a word, how many Christians doe we finde (who have any sentiment of Religion in them) who are as solicitous and careful to know that there was a *Julius Cæsar*, and what is reported of his noble exploits in war, as they are to know that there was
a *Jesus*

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

a *Jesus Christ*, what he hath done and suffered for us, and what he hath commanded us to believe and practise? Wherefore the continuation of *Divine tradition* is much more strong and infallible for this cause, then is the continuation of any *humane tradition*.

The fifth disparity.

Fifthly, All the disparities which we have hitherto brought betwixt these two traditions, have been fetched out of the principle and bowels of nature it self, which doe clearly evince that the certainty of the tradition of our revealed truths doth infinitely excel all traditions of humane truths. But we will now add a principle of an higher nature, which, because it is altogether of a supream and Divine quality, doth take away all dispute in this question, doth leave no difficulty behind it, and doth in fine, totally decide and determine this controversie. And this it is, that Christ did so constitute his Church, as that he intended it should last to the end of the world. Nor sure did he this so indiscreetly as not to provide some such efficacious meanes, whereby it might *infallibly* persist and persevere according to his designe. To this his Church he hath given most glorious titles of honour and dignity. This Church he calls his *Spouse*, *I will espouse thee to me* (saith he) *for ever*. And the tie of this marriage is to be perpetually indissolvable, to wit, by faith; for *we stand by faith*. He calls the faithful his members, and this Church his body. *Doe you not know that your bodies are members of Christ?* Wherefore the Spirit of truth is the soul of this body, his Church, which the Apostle

Oie. 2.

Rom. 11.

1 Cor. 6.

poftle calleth *The pillar and ground of truth.* *Against which our Saviour hath promised, that the gates of hell shall not prevail.* With this Church he hath alfo promised that he will be ever prefent. *I (faith he) will be with you alwayes, even to the confummation of the world.* He will reign in the houfe of *Jacob*, and there will be no end of his reign. He will reign furely by a true faith. And therefore he will never forfake his Church, wherein, left we fhould be *like children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine*, he hath promised to give his Spirit to the Church, *which fhould bring it into all truth.* *I will give you (faith he) a comforter, that he may remain with you, the Spirit of truth, which fhall remain with you, a comforter, the holy Ghoft, who fhall teach you all things, and fuggelt all things unto you which I have told you.* *The Spirit of truth fhall teach you all truth.* Wherefore the Church is fufained by the hand of Chrift, is protected with his fateguard, and is governed by his wifedome, as by its head. Yet are not thefe things faid, as indifferently common to all believers, or as to be applied to every particular perfon feparately and diftinctly; as though we were to believe every cobbler, tinker, or filly womans imagination to be an inftinct and inspiration of the holy Ghoft: But we are to believe thefe things as fpoken to the Pastors and Governors of the Church, gathered together after the example of the Apoftles: or to the whole Church, taken in its latitude. Which is, *The houfe of God built upon a rock*, and ftrongly fetled: Over which he would have his Bi-

1 Tim. 3.

Mat. 16.

Mat. 28.

Eph. 4.

John 14.

Mat. 9.

A^{cts} 20.Hebr. 13.
Eph. 4.

Mat. 5.

Mat. 18.

Bishops to watch, whom the holy Ghost hath put to govern the Church of God. And to whom likewise he hath given charge to have a care of his flock; As being to give an account for their soules. And he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of his ministry, and for the edifying of the body of Christ, etc. To these he said; You are the salt of the earth, the light of the world, the City placed upon a hill, the candle set upon a candlestick. To whom, whosoever doth not obey, is to be esteemed like a heathen and publican.

Now come forth *Luther* and *Calvin* upon the Stage, you that have dared to spit in the sacred face of the dear Spouse of Christ: Come out Schismatical rebel, thou that dost not blush to spue forth thy reproachful poyson of virulent bitterness against the venerable body of Christ, and the beauty of its unspotted faith. Appear, I say, in thy likeness, thou, thou whosoever art in divorce with this Christian and Catholick Hierarchy, and art not ashamed to call this Religious Church of Christ (fair and beautiful in her holy and sound Doctrine) the whore of Babylon, an adulteress, filthy, corrupted, thus blasting and defiling thy own Mothers honor with thy no lesse impudent then blasphemous tongue. See how you despise God Almightyes special providence towards his Church; see how you contemn Christs promises; And see how little you esteeme the assistance of the holy Ghost.

But we will now compare the tradition of Christian Doctrine, with the tradition of Scripture:

ture: That is to say, whether the tradition of some one article of our Christian and revealed Doctrine, be not of greater certainty, then is the tradition of some Book or Epistle of the new Testament. And first we will suppose (that we may not run into needlesse repetitions) what we have said in the first chapter concerning canonical Scripture. First then it is evident, that the same article of Christian Doctrine was taught and preacht at the same time in several parts of the world. But the same written Book was originally had in one only place from whence it came by little & little to be further dispersed and promulgated. If therefore we consider one only City or Province, the same article of Doctrine is no more subject to perish, but might be as well recovered, in case of persecution, destruction, or any other subversion of that City or Province, as any written book. And yet in this very case, the tradition of such an article is more secure, then the tradition of such a Book. First, Because the article was communicated to many, the Book to few. Secondly, the Doctrine was heard and understood by many; the book was read only by few. Thirdly, The Doctrine did much more belong to the Discipline of a Christian life, being often repeated, often explicated, and even animated, as it were, by the delivery of a living voice; all which bare reading hath not. Further the authority of the book did depend, at least in the beginningo f one only witness; but the Doctrine was settled by the testimony of all its hearers.

A comparison between the tradition of a point of doctrine, and the tradition of a book of Scripture.

If we compare the universal tradition of any

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

one article of Doctrine with the universal tradition of any one book or epistle ; we shall find a wide disparity. For it is manifest, that the knowledge of the author of any one book, in its beginning, did come from the testimony of some one man ; but the knowledge of the authority of every article of our revealed Doctrine, was certified, even at the first, by the universal believe and acknowledgment of all those who heard it preached all the world over. Every book therefore got, at the first, all the authority that it hath, from the asseveration and testimony of some one Church or Congregation at the most ; but the certainty of every point of Doctrine, even when it was first preached and divulged, was settled and established by *universal tradition*. The Doctrine therefore is built upon the constant asseverations and consenting assertions of many millions of men dispersed all the world over far and neer. So that we may well prove a book of Scripture to be canonical by the universal tradition, of Christian Doctrine ; but not on the contrary, that a point of Doctrine is of universal tradition, by the authority of a Canonical Book of scripture. For this is a good and solid consequence ; The Doctrine contained in any book of scripture is clearly consonant and conform to the Doctrine of universal tradition, therefore the book in this respect, is worthy to be put into the Canon, and to be esteemed Canonical ; But not on the contrary this Doctrine agreeing and consonant to the Canonical book ; therefore it is of universal tradition.

Hence

Hence it follows likewise, that since the authority of every book or Epistle, took its first rise from the testimony of one only man, or at most, of one only perticular Church or Congregation, there can never be had afterwards a greater certainty of the author of such a Book or Epistle, then may arise from the witness of that man or Congregation. For the universal receiving of such a book, or its being put into the number of Canonical Scriptures (which we know hath been done of several Books by the Catholick Church after some years) was grounded upon the asseveration of that particular man or Congregation. Whence it is manifest, that by how much more weighty and certain is the testimony and authority of the universal Catholick Church, then of any single man or Congregation; by so much more strong and constant is the certainty of any article of doctrine, then of the author of any Book.

The second difference.

But our Schismaticks bring in the assertion and acknowledgment of all the ancient and modern hereticks, in favour and proof of the tradition of holy scriptures. But no multitude of such as err, doth any way justifie the error; nor is the plurality of witnesses to be valued at all, unlesse they be convenient and lawful ones. What imports it that *Arrians*, *Eutychians*, *Nestorians*, or other such-like fellows, do acknowledge the holy scriptures; for being the Catholick Church hath cast them out of her society and Communion, she hath surely judged them altogether unworthy to be held for witnesses of any Christian and

A confirmation of that difference.

Catho-

Catholick truth. But like to like, quoth the Divell to the Collier. For whilst *Schismaticks* lean upon these mens testimony, they become worthy of such companions. And if they looked well about them, they would find themselves likewise obliged to esteem all Catholicks unworthy to bear witness of any Christian truth whatsoever. But let them passe for witnesses; what, I pray, can these rebels and condemned Apostats testifie, but only that they received the holy Scriptures from the Catholicks. Whom since they do acknowledge to have been the keepers of those sacred Registers, how do they know that the copies which were given them, were true and entire and not vitiated and corrupted? especially since they accuse the doctrine of the Catholicks (from whom they had those holy writings) to be full of errors and heresies.

whether the
principles of
nature or of
Religion are
the stronger.

It now seems almost needlesse to compare Religion with nature, that is, whether of these two is more firmly and strongly grounded. I do not intend this comparifon is to be so stated, as that I conceive Religion could possibly subsist, if human nature should perish: But whether the principles and grounds of the one or the other, considered in their own proper and several conditions, are of themselves more strong and fixed.

First then we may suppose, as certain, that God himself is the end of all creatures, in relation to their Creation, but the clear sight of him, or the perfect knowledge of his *Deity* in it self, is the end of rational and immortal Creatures. Whence it is, that nature was created for faith, I mean natural things

things, for supernatural things. Wherefore by how much more excellent, and more perfect are Divine things above human things, that is, eternal above temporal, by so much more firm and strong ought to be the principles whereupon they are built. And therefore it was necessary, that nature it self should be corroborated by some supports of a superior order, to the end it might be a more fixed, and immovable pillar and basis of a supernatural building.

Further, who can deny, but that God hath founded his Church in that manner, as that it might last and flourish with a greater blessing, then the nature of corruptible things, which he hath created in a lower sphere. And yet he hath imbued even these transitory things with a constant condition of a perseverant subsistence. And whosoever will but seriously contemplate the *end* and the *means* of the redemption of mankind, he shall finde, that by how much greater is the price and value of this sublime and perfect work, then of any natural being whatsoever, by so much more full and abundant grace of perseverance will he certainly judge Gods wilddome hath given unto it. Besides, it is much more easie to demonstrate and find out the reason how and why the Christian and Catholick Church doth come to last and persist thus constantly, then to comprehend how mankind doth come to have thus invincibly subsisted.

Finally, (that we may at length put a period to this long Chapter of Tradition) it seems very evident that what we have said, if well understood

The conclusion of this Chapter.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

stood, doth clearly evince and demonstrate the *infallible* certainty of universal tradition, especially in respect of our revealed and Catholick truths. But I know it is not in every mans hability and capacity, to penetrate into the force, no nor to judge of the evidence of every demonstration, though never so perfect and clear to those who are versed in such professions. But however there is no man, if I be not deceived, who will not see, that there is so much security in these arguments, as any reasonable man can desire for the rule of his moral actions, and goverment of his whole life. Yea such a security as any man, who will take the pains to examine the businesse with exactitude and moderation, shall think it be most convenient, and best besitting human nature. But if he will neither believe, nor yeald to the skill and judgment of the whole present Catholick Church, in what age soever he may live, unlesse his roving fancie may first be satisfied in all such objections, as his or any other phansiful mans imagination can possible fame or invent ; or which the multitude of several occasions, and diversity of accidents in so many hundreds of years, thousand of places, and millions of men, may have occasioned ; I cannot think it worthy the pains of any wise man to trouble him with such an unreasonable wrangler.

THE

The ninth Chapter.

Of Generall Councils, and of the Pope.

The first Lesson.

Of the authority of General Councils in relation to their Declarations of articles of faith, or revealed truth.

According to the title of this Lesson, we will treat here briefly of the authority of General Councils, under this only notion or consideration, as they are declarers of revealed truths to the universal Church. For of what weight and authority their decrees are in relation to any other effect as of Ecclesiastical Government, Discipline, or the like (wherein they are opposed and disobeyed by hereticks) we shall have occasion to examine hereafter.

Having shewed and settled the certainty of universal tradition, and having declared that it consists chiefly in its *universality*, it remaineth that we enquire and seek out, by what means or by what way we may certainly know these revealed articles, and divine institutions, which do rely upon this tradition. And being that that which we seek after must be universal or Catholick (for to the end that the means whereby we are to know what is delivered by universal tradition, may be as certain as the tradition itselfe, it must be as

The means which is to be declarative of what is delivered by tradition must be something that is universal.

universal as the tradition (It is evident that we are not to expect this certainty and assurance of *universality*, from any perticular or singular man. For whatsoever any perticular man (whosoever he be) may declare or decree, it cannot have the nature and quality of *universall tradition* only in that it doth proceed from such a particular denuntiator; although this quality, of universality may belong to what he denounceth, in as much as it may be one and the self same thing with what is the universal judgment and belief of the whole society. Yea though such a thing were testified by a considerable number gathered together in a Council, yet unlesse it were universall and Catholick, it could not have the certainty of universall tradition.

Bishops in
Councils are
witnesses, not
makers of Di-
vine truth.

It follows likewise out of what we have said (which many divines do perticularly note and maintajn (that the Pastors and Rectors of the Church of Christ (what authority soever they otherwise have,) are only *keepers* and *witnesses* of our revealed truths, though most faithful and invincible ones. whether we consider them as dispersed all the world over, every one in his *Diocese* or parish, teaching and governing their flocks; or as universally gathered together, in due circumstances. But no truly learned and understanding Catholick will say, that they are *makers* of articles of faith; whereof we have several times given the reason, to wit, that every article of revealed faith, doth *essentially* rely upon Gods revealing it; And we all acknowledge, there are no new revelations given to the Church

in

in common, or to any man in particular, upon which an article of Catholike faith can be grounded. To say therefore that the number of revealed articles of our Catholick faith may be increased, must either proceed from malice or ignorance. It is therefore to be supposed as an undoubted maxime amongst all Catholicks, that Christ is the sole and onely *Founder* and *Maker* of all revealed truths, and Divine Institutions.

After this truth follows another, which St. *Austin* remarks in his Epistle 118. to *Januarius*: *What things* (saith he) *Christ hath prescribed, let no man dare change them.* That is, As the Church cannot frame, nor make, nor obtrude upon her faithful people any new thing, either as *Divinely revealed*, or *Divinely instituted*, pretending it to be an article of our Catholick faith: So likewise it is not in the power of the whole Church to vary or change in the least degree any truth revealed by Christ, or any practise of Divine Institution. According to that of St. *Matthew*, *Whosoever therefore shall break one even of the least of my commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the Kingdome of Heaven, one jot or one tittle shall no wise pass from the Law, till all be fulfilled.*

What is of divine institution cannot be changed.

Mat. 5.

For the more solid and clear solution of this question, I conceive two things are to be noted and supposed. First, that no truth, much lesse any Christian truth, can be ordinarily and naturally transmitted and conveyed from ear to ear, and from man to man, but by the means of humane speech; which cannot likewise be performed

Two things to be noted in this point.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

med but by voices and words. Now all words are either equivocal of themselves, or at least may be variously and diversly taken by a multitude of Auditors. Whence it is, that in all discourse and verbal communication, there doth generally arise much ambiguity and diversity of intelligence. Secondly, that such is the natural disposition of mens minds and understandings, that the same expressed truths are diversly conceived and understood by divers men; yea, and from the self-same truth divers men doe infer divers consequences. Hence it is, that even amongst Catholicks there arise many disputes and contentions about several sequels deduced out of our articles of faith. Yea even this is often the source and occasion of heresies. For when there falls out some disagreement upon the various understanding of some revealed truth, and that the weaker and worst side becomes violent and passionate in the cause; and that in the weakness of humane infirmity there offereth it selfe some strong and convenient power to back it, thence presently starts up an heresie, which by little and little casteth off the sweet yoke of due obedience to the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. For this reason hath the Divine wisdom provided a remedy against the poyson of *Heresses*, which himself hath foretold us *must needs fall out*, and which all Christians, who know any thing that belongs to Christianity doe know, hath been happily and chiefly performed by General Councils.

1. Cor. 11.

The first Council was of the Apostles themselves.

The first of General Councils, was that of the Apostles themselves at Hierusalem, *to consider of this*

this matter. Who gathered together in the holy spirit did decree and appoint those things, which the holy writ doth tell us. Ags 15.

The nature and definition of a General Council (which is a subject of dispute amongst Divines) doth not onely consist, as we conceive, in that it is a general convocation, or in that it is called by the Pope, if there chance to be but few Bishops present : Nor that all Bishops throughout the whole Christian world, as well Schismaticks and Hereticks (if there be any at that time) as others, such as may be detained by sickness, or by any other just or unjust cause, ought all to be present. But that some such considerable part or number of Bishops of several churches, coming out divers Kingdomes, Nations, Countries, and Provinces, who are united in catholick communion, should be deputed and present, as may make the common assembly arise to such a convenient degree of *universality*, that there can be no just suspicion (at least in those things wherein they are generally disintereffed) of any wicked conspiracy, or seditious faction. Insomuch, that a prudent man may rightly say; This assembly is truly a General one.

What makes a Council to be a General one.

This supposed, we may now sure conclude, first that it follows most evidently out of what we have said that a General Council can most certainly, and without all possible danger of error, denounce and declare (which others call decree and define) what ever is directly and expressly Divinity revealed or instituted. Which is nothing else but that, these Bishops all together, yea and every one

How a General Council can define what is an article of faith.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

one of them alone can witness whatsoever is either believed or practised in all, and every singular of their Provinces, as an Article of revealed Doctrine, or as a practise of Religion Divinely instituted. To make this more clear, let us put an example.

An example
of this.

There starts up an Apostata Innovator, who blasphemeth the Sacrifice of the Masse with the title of abomination ; or who denies the true and real body of Christ to be contained in the Sacrament of the Altar. The Bishops hearing this, gather themselves together in a Council, after the example of the Apostles, *to consider of this matter*, who can *certainly* and *infallibly* testify, both mutually to each other, and to the whole world, that this new and unheard-of assertion is directly opposite and formally contrary to what they and all the rest of the Christian world doe believe as an Article of revealed Doctrine, or as a practise of Religion Divinely instituted, taught, and exercised in every one of their severall Provinces throughout the universal Church. Nay, it is manifest, that there is no possible force or power able to make and induce all these Bishops gathered together from so many severall and divers Kingdomes, Nations, and Countries, to denounce and declare any thing contrary to what is believed and practised in every Church respectively, and in all Churches universally, as a Divine Tenet or Institution.

How Bishops
in a Council
can define no-
thing but
truth.

For who can be so mad as to imagine that all these Bishops universally gathered together, should

should declare the Masse to be an abomination, and that this is the Catholick belief of the whole Church universally received for such from their immediate fore-fathers, whilst at the same time an infinite number of Priests in all their several Provinces respectively do dayly celebrate the holy Sacrifice of the Masse in a venerable manner, all the faithful people assisting and adoring. This, I say, cannot be done, not only by a Council of pious and prudent men, but not even by the most tumultuous conventicle of never so foolish and lying fellows. Yet is not the testimony of every singular Bishop given in the behalf of any revealed truth, of as much weight, as is the testimony of them all consenting together. For although the testimony of any one of them is most true, and that which he testifies is publickly and commonly known to his whole Provincial or Diocesane Church; yet the perfect and absolute certainty of the tradition of revealed things, consisteth chiefly in the universal consent of the whole Catholick Church, as we have shewed before. What we have specified of two only articles for example sake, against *Luther* and *Calvin*, may be applyed with the like force to all other heresies one by one.

To all this I easily believe any wise and compassionate man will presently assent, so the question be onely of such things, as are directly and expressly either opposite or co-incident with such Divine Articles and Institutions as are acknowledged by the universal Church. But if the question be of the proper signification of some terms,

The difficulty is greater when those things which are so defined are not expressly revealed.

OR

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

or of amore full and ample explication of some revealed truth; or in fine, of some consequence and sequel deduced out of any of our revealed truths, then the difficulty is much more hard to resolve. That is to say, whether the decrees of General Councils be in these cases *infallible*. All which we know have somtimes happened in the condemnation of the dogmes both of antient and of late hereticks; as of *Arrius*, and *Pellagius*, *Luther*, and *Calvin*.

Councils have
two chiefe
ends.

We are to look into this difficulty with more exactitude and attention then ordinary, which that we may resolve the more fully, it is to be noted, that General Counsels have two principal *ends*, which that they might attain, Christ hath likewise instituted and given them two *means*. The ends are *union*, and *truth*: *union* to prevent *schisme*; *Truth* to beat down *heresie*. The first *means* which is to prevent *schisme*, is the Divine authority and jurisdiction of *Bishops* and *Pastors* instituted by Christ, whereof we shall have occasion to speak hereafter. In the interim every man knows, that it is, and ever hath been the holy and divinely intituted order and custom of the Church, that as soon as any contention doth arise, whether in matter of fact or doctrine, wherein it is perceived, that both sides grow hot in the business, The *Bishops* presently gather themselves together in a Council, and by there sentence or judgment, the dispute is ended, as farr as the precincts of their jurisdiction do extend; being their subjects are obliged to acquies to the judgment of their superiors, and to live in peace under their govern.

government. And if this Council be a General one, and consequently that there is no appeal to be made to a superior judge, being the highest Tribunal in the Church upon earth, there follows streight an universal reconciliation and pascification throughout the whole Church. The second means whereby General Councils do destroy heresies, is their very method and manner of declaring or defining things, as we have already explicated; to wit, when all these Bishops gathered together, do unanimously witness the truth of any revealed doctrine, or Divine institution, according to the form, or upon the *tenure of universal tradition*. But if it happen, that the proposition which is to be declared, or defined, be not directly and expressly in terms, as it lyes, an article of our revealed and Catholick faith; nor consequently, that they opposite to this proposition, which is to be condemned and anathematized, is not formally contrary to our revealed and Catholick faith, it is to be diversly censured, according as it may deserve; unto which censures, as unto all other Decrees of this supream Tribunal, every good Catholick doth acknowledge, that we owe a Religious obedience.

It is to be noted here, that to the end any divine truth be an article of faith, it must be both revealed and delivered by an universal and continued succession from the Apostles times. So that (as we have already noted) it is not sufficient that any tenet be an article of Divine faith, that it be only revealed, nor that it be only of universal tradition: for divers things are thought

What is to be done when such a proposition is to be examined in a Council as is neither directly and expressly an article of faith, nor yet an heresie.

What is required that a truth be an article of faith.

by Divines to be revealed, because they think them either to be expressely found in the holy scripture, or that they are manifest by such consequences, as may be evidently deduced out of our divine and Catholick truths ; which nevertheless are not esteemed and reckoned by the Church, to be in the number of the articles of our Catholick faith, whereof we shall bring many examples in the ensuing discourse. There be likewise divers things which do constantly rely upon universal tradition (as that *St Peter* was at *Rome* ; that the *B Virgins* body was assumed or taken up into heaven, and the like) which are not revealed, and therefore are excluded out of the number of the articles of our Catholick faith.

The common distinction of explicite and implicite faith is examined.

Further we are to note for the more exact intelligence of this difficulty, that there is an old and common distinction amongst divines of *explicit* and *implicit* faith, which because they do not in this, no more then in many other things, labour to clear the signification of these terms, they fall into several disputes and contentions, by reason of the equivocal and various acception of these words. These Divines when they tell you, that new propositions or tenets may be defined by the Church, and yet dare not avouch that the Church hath any new revelation given her, they strait flye to this distinction, thinking all secure when they affirm, that a new or newly discovered truth defined by the Church (which they therefore conceive, ought to be believed with Divine and Catholick faith) was, say they *implicitly* believed before by the faithful. We are therefore

fore to enquire what we understand when we say, that such a truth is contained *implicitly* in such another; which may be understood two manner of waies. First, when one and the self same truth is not expressly and clearly enough spoken or related; which being only intimated in some few and obscure words, the truth lyeth hid, as it were and in some sort envolved in certain *plies* or folds, which therefore may be opened or explicated in a plainer and more ample paraphrase. Secondly, when out of one truth, another may be drawn by a sequele or consequence, and this by reason of the connection which they have together. And in this second sence all natural truths are contained *implicitly*, in any one truth only. For by the perfect and absolute knowledge of any one natural truth, all other natural truths may be drawn and known; So necessarily and strongly linked is the chain and immutable order of natures fabrick. Yea and all supernatural truths are in this sort contained *implicitly* in any one, so that from the perfect comprehension of any one, we might come to the knowledge of all the rest. But Divines sure do not understand their *implicit faith* in this sence; For I conceive we have sufficiently demonstrated already, that no truth which is only deduced by some perticular mans ratiocination out of our articles of faith, can never reach to the absolute certainty and solidity of our Divine and Catholick faith. Such truths as those may have the nature and quality of Theological Science, being thus discovered and maintained by the discourse of some privat men, which

These words have two significations.

All natural truths are connexed.

The true signification of the word *implicit*.

1 John 5.
John 1.

although they should come afterwards to be defined and decreed by the Church, yet would they never acquire a higher degree of certainty, though they would be of greater authority. In the former and proper signification of this word *implicit*, it is manifest, that the same truth, or article of faith, clearly and fully expressed, is said to be the *explicit* sense of it, but obscurely and compendiously intimated, is said to be the *implicit* sense of it. Which we find by experience in the divers manners of expressing the mysteries of the *Trinity* and of the *Incarnation* which are briefly intimated, and related in the holy Scripture, in very few words. *As, the father, the word, and the holy Ghost, these three are all one.* And, *the word was made flesh*; which (although the selfe same thing) St. *Athanasius* his Creed doth clearly expound and explicate in an ample and full paraphrase.

There is yet another manner of believing *implicitly*, which, as we have already noted, is only in the mind of the believer, to wit, when he doth so believe the sayings or writings of any body in general and common, as that without examination or knowledge of any thing in particular, he doth adhere to and believe all whatsoever such an one should say or write. And in this sense we say, that a Christian may *implicitly* believe all the articles of our faith, whilest he doth constantly and strongly assent unto the Catholick Church, teaching and delivering by tradition all her revealed truths, though perhaps they may be unknown unto him in particular.

Now

Now it remaineth that we enquire what certainty the decrees of General Councils have in such things as are not expressly, and in formal terms, neither Divinely revealed, nor universally delivered by tradition. Which, because this may happen either in matters of fact, that is, in some practise of Religion of Divine institution, or in a point of revealed Doctrine, which doth regard the internal act of the mind, we are to observe, That there is no article of revealed faith, which is not either directly or immediatly requisite to some practise of our Christian Religion, and government of a Christian life, or at least necessary to the generality of Christians, by its connection with some chief head of Religion and Divine worship. The things which may be declared or defined, are to be distinguished; for if the question be only of a more clear and ample explication of any revealed truth delivered by universal tradition, that is, that the same truth is to be expressed in more perspicuous and plain terms, this surely can be done by the Church, or by a General Council. And the reason is, because the Catholick Church doth not know and deliver her revealed doctrine by the bare and naked outside of words & material letters, which are different and divers in every severall Kingdom, Nation, and Country; but by the sense and signification of words and speech, which is instilled into the hearts of Christians, and imprinted in their souls by frequent instruction and discipline. Of this we have many examples; yea, almost all the decrees of General Councils do principally ayme at, and

Of what force are the decrees of Councils in such things as are not expressly articles of faith.

There is no Christian truth which is not in some sort needfull to practise.

perform this; which we know the Church did when upon occasion, three hundred years agoe, she exprest and explicated the conversion of Bread into the Body of Christ, by the name of *Transubstantiation*. The reason of which manner of speech we will produce in its proper place.

Conclusions
drawn out of
articles of faith
are of two
sorts.

But if the question be concerning the truth of any consequence or sequell which is or may be drawn from our revealed, & universally delivered doctrine, then we find that these consequences may be of two kinds. Some are so evident and manifest at the first sight, that no man in his right wits, (supposing the truth of the premises) can possibly doubt of the truth of the inference. Of this kind was that truth, which the Church did rightly, and most certainly declare against the *Monothelites*, viz. That there were two *wills* in Christ: For being that the hypothesis or supposition of two *natures* in Christ, *Divine* and *humane*, is a truth revealed and universally delivered by tradition, the consequence is most clear without all doubt or possibility of error (if I may call it a consequence, and that it be not the same truth more delated and explicated) that there are two *wills* in Christ. Whatsoever therefore is declared and decreed by the *Catholick Church*, or by a *General Council* of this nature and quality, hath the true and absolute certainty of Divine faith, and the same which all other truths have, which are revealed and universally delivered by *Catholick tradition*; being nothing else indeed but the same revealed truth now more clearly explicated, which before was *implicitly* believed by all, and *explicitly* believed

ved by the more learned.

There be other Sequels and consequences which do not so manifestly and evidently appear, but that there is required some study and science to perceive and comprehend their force and validity. The evidence and certainty of these consequences may be of severall degrees, either according to the innate obscurity or perspicuity of the subject, or according to the more or lesse capacity in learning and judgment, which he may have who looks into such a discourse or Syllogisme. These truths (whereof we find divers defined by some of our latter General Councils) cannot have that supream, and Catholick certainty, which we give unto the articles of our faith in the vertue of universal tradition. For the Church doth not acknowledge any new beams of Divine light to shine every day upon her, whereby she can have an *infallible* certainty, or equal to that which she hath of her revealed and universally delivered articles of faith, in relation to such truths as may perhaps be newly discovered, and in some sort made appear by the profound ratiocination of some perticular and learned men. For being these truths do rely upon the discourse of these private men, it is evident, as we have shewed heretofore, that this is not a *means* free from error, nor convenient to ground an article of our Divine and Catholick faith. Nevertheless, when such like truths as these are defined by General Councils to prevent *Schisme*, and preserve the peace of the Church, every true Son of such a Mother knows, that such decrees are to be obeyed.

Some

whether it be
lawfull to
doubt of the
decrees of
general Coun-
cels when
they are only
concerning
sequels drawn
from some
article of faith

Some perhaps out of curiosity enquire, whether it be lawful to doubt of the truth of these decrees. To whom I answer, that I should much fear, that such a doubt were the fruit of a proud and haughty Spirit, especially if he should exteriorly testify any absolute dislike of it. For to what end a supreme Seat or Tribunal, judging even in things belonging to their profession and discipline if it shall be as free and lawful for every subject, after their last and definitive sentence, to think and preach the contrary, as well as before? shall every disciple be above his Master? ought we not to believe our superiors judging in their own trade? especially, when all of the same discipline and profession are of one opinion? Bishops and Governors of the Church do judge in a General Council as Masters and Doctors; but the People, as disciples, are bound to learn and obey. You will perhaps object, that there may be found some singular man, or some few men, who may so far excell all the rest in learning and Science, that they may certainly and evidently perceive there was some mixture of human infirmity in the giving of these judgments or Sentences. I answer, that though we should admit this supposition, yet were it only lawful for this man, or these few men, to advertise privately the learned sort of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchie, and that with great precaution and much humility.

whether in
these cases any
man is bound
to an internal
act of faith.

It may be further asked, whether any man in these and the like cases is bound to an internal act of Divine Faith, which we know not whether it be always in a mans power to effect. Certainly

tainly, as long as any man doth think that such an act is contrary to the light of nature and reason, he cannot be obliged to produce it. But if the knowledge of the truth in this matter, whereby he would be certainly and infallibly perswaded that he ought to produce such an act of faith; If, I say, this knowledge were easie to be had, certainly it were a grievous fault in him not to obey the Church, commanding him to be of this belief. And the chief reason is, because the sole authority of the Catholick Church is an argument of more weight and moment, then any reason for which we think it fit to believe whatsoever doth mainly direct and govern humane life and society.

Whether rebellious and perverse men may be forced and compelled to the Catholick belief, as wicked and depraved men in other vices may be; yea, whether for a violent passion of minde, and obstinate wilfulnesse in Apostacy, men may be punished as they may be for being guilty of other crimes, I will not determine. It is sufficient for the present that we acknowledge that an Apostata may be prohibited and punished by the Church with spiritual paines, or Ecclesiastical censures: As he may be also by the Civil Magistrate with corporal paines, as imprisonment, banishment, and the like. But that *Hersticks* may be put to death, though convicted, yea though relapsed, and most obstinate (setting aside all danger of rebellion and sedition against the Civil State) was never held a Catholick Article of Christian Religion by the universal Church. Nor

Whether men
may be forced
to believe.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

doe all our most pious and most learned Catholicks approve the practise of the Inquisition. But this is a question needless to our purpose, and out of our subject.

The second Lesson.

Of the Popes authority, in relation to his declaring of matters of faith.

What is the measure of the jurisdiction of the supream head of every society.

EVery supream head of a Society hath not equal authority, nor the same jurisdiction: The Latitude whereof is to be taken from the Lawes which were settled in the beginning of each society respectively, or from the parts which may have been made with mutual agreement, or from the just and lawful customs which have been admitted, and are in use.

The Pope is the head of the Church

No Catholick denies the Bishop of *Rome* to be the Supreme, visible, and only Head of the whole Catholick Church upon earth. But I conceive it very hard to fix the certain and undoubted bonds and limits of the plenitude of his jurisdiction appointed by *Divine Institution*. However it is not my intention to discusse all those questions concerning this point, which our later Divines doe handle at large in their voluminous writings, which if we should examine precisely, and look more exactly upon the subject then upon the words, we should finde the greatest part of what they say, to be either unuseful or uncertain. But for such things as doe particularly belong to our purpose, we shall have occasion to discusse them here.

hereafter, though with our ordinary brevity. In the interim. we will treat in few words of the Popes power and authority only in relation to his declaring or defining of revealed truths, and of our articles of faith.

For the clearer solotion of this question, we must call to mind two things, which we have already settled. Two things to be noted.

The first is, That we distinguished truths Christian into revealed truths, which are common to the whole Church, and into Catholick truths not revealed. But these we said did rely upon universal and *infallible tradition*, though in some sort historical. 1. That there are divers kinds of Christian truths.,

The second sort of these truths we sub-divided into such as doe directly belong to the Doctrine or practise of our Christian Religion, or at least doe nearly concern it by some necessary connection thereunto : As all those things which are related in the Scripture, of the birth, miracles, and death of our Saviour Christ ; and also many other things which are not in the sacred Text, yet are believed upon *universal tradition*, as that Lent was begun by the Apostles, that St. Peter was at *Rome*, and the like : And into such truths as are purely historical, that is, which do belong to our Christian and Ecclesiastical History, but little concern Religion : And of these we finde some even in the Scripture it self : As that St. Paul left his cloak at *Troas* : others there be delivered by tradition, but of a lesse certainty ; as that the B. Virgins body was assumed into Heaven. And although such truths onely are mat-

Tim. 4.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

ters of Divine faith (speaking properly) as are revealed, yet such also as we call *Catholick* (whether they be in the Scripture, or doe rely onely upon *universal tradition*, so they be annexed with any necessary relation to the body of Religion) are acknowledged to belong so nearly to our Christian & Catholick faith, as whosoever should dare deny any of them perversly, he would deserve to be immediately cut off, and separated from the communion of the Catholick Church; yea, and he who should obstinately impugne and withstand those truths which we call only *historical*, and which doe not make any formal part of our Faith or Religion, yet were he not to be held very sound in Christian belief.

2. How an
opinion is not
hereticall.

The second thing to be noted, is, that we do onely treat at the present of decreeing and declaring articles of Faith. And it is certain, that no such tenet is an article of faith, whereof we see the opposite and contrary proposition publicly maintained and taught by many learned and pious Catholick Authors, the universal Church looking on, and being silent. For being the Authors of these opinions are not condemned nor excommunicated by the Church, but are esteemed true and lively members of the Catholick Society, notwithstanding that they doe maintain these opinions; clear it is that the contrary cannot be held by the universal church to be an Article of Divine and catholick faith. And therefore it is free for every one in this case to imbrace which opinion he shall think fit, without the least note of heresie or error.

Now

Now therefore our first conclusion may be, that whatsoever is disputed both affirmatively and negatively by Catholick Divines, though with never so much heat and bitterness one against another, whether it be through their over strong adhesion to their own particular interpretation of the Scripture; or to the opinions of their Patrons and Superiors, or to their consequences deduced out of the principles of faith, it is manifest that neither part can have the true nature and quality of an assent of Divine and Catholick faith.

Every opinion disputed amongst Catholicks is free to be held either way.

Whence it follows, that the Pope in his person only, cannot so determine and decree such disputed questions as these, as that in vertue of his sole definition, either side can come to be an article of our Divine and Catholick faith. It is true, that Divines do dispute, whether if at any time the Pops have defined such questions as these agitated on both sides in the schools, whether, I say, their decrees be *infallible by Christs institution*, yea, and whether any decree only proceeding from the Pope, that is, without a General Council, be for this only reason, *infallible by Divine right*. These questions we see disputed in the schools on both sides by very many most learned, and most pious Catholick authours, as well antient as modern; whereof we never heard as yet that either part hath been prohibited or disallowed by any authentickall decree or Censure; wherefore we may conclude, that no Catholick is bound to assent and adhear to either side, as to an article of our Catholick and Divine faith; Although we are bound to bear all due respect and obedience to the

The Pope cannot make a new article of faith.

Whence proceeds the infallibility of the Church.

the Popes definitions. Our second conclusion may be comfortable to the principles which we have already settled, that the solidity of the Church in supernatural belief, or the certainty, and *infallibility* of our adhesions in our Divine and Catholick faith, is not to be chiefly attributed to any Priviledge given to the Sea of Rome by *Divine concession*, nor as given by Christ to the Pops person, as he is St. *Peters* Successor (although some Divines do seem to maintain this with graat probability; and that tis certain, that the Pope, as head of the Church, can do all things convenient to this title, and necessary for the performance of this charge) but as relying upon the *universal and Catholick tradition* of the Church, supported by the promises of Jesus Christ. More then this I need not say, since I intend not to discusse such Theological questions, as are problematically agitated learned by our Catholick authors, but onely to distinguish such tenets as have the solidity, and certainty of Divine faith, from all such opinions as are any waies uncertain.

What general Councils cannot doe, the Pope cannot doe.

Further, whatsoever some Catholick writers do think is not in the power of a General Council (whose power in relation to revealed truths, they cenceive, doth only consist in declaring what is delivered by tradition) these authors, I say, do refuse, with no lesse reason, to give any more then this to the Pope. For they easily think, that to know and judge what is of *universall tradition*, cannot belong in a greater degree to the Pope alone, then to the whole Catholick Church, gathered together in a General Council. And we have not
only

only excluded from the number of our articles of faith all new, or newly discovered truths; but we have also shewed, that they can never come into the Catalogue of our revealed truths. And we have further shewed, that the quality of *universal tradition*, is altogether necessary to all the articles of our Divine faith. And lastly we have shewed, that the *means*, or testimony of this tradition ought to be so often, so publick, and so universal, as that it may be clearly apparent even to the externall senses of every Christian.

Hence it is manifest, that nothing at all hath ever been declared by any Pope, as an article of our Divine and Catholick faith, or whereunto all Catholicks are obliged to adhere with Divine belief, but only such things, as the universal Church did ever believe, and will doubtlesly believe, until the end of the world; And that with an *explicit faith*, by the great lights of the Church, to wit, its Pastors and Doctors; And with an *implicit faith*, by the ignorant and unlearned faithful, according to the proper signification of the words, as we have explicated them above.

What the
Pope doth
never define.

Nevertheless, what power of defining even such things as are not expressly articles of our Divine and Catholick faith, we are affirmed in the precedent lesson, ought to be given to General Councils, the same we conceive doth in some sort belong to the Pope. For although we know that that St. Hierome saied; *The authority of the world (Christian) is greater then the authority of the City, (Rome)* yet certainly it is convenient, that the head of the Church have authority to take up
con-

What the
Pope can doe.

contentions and debates; and that he have a power to determine such hard and disputable questions, as may arrive, and endanger the peace of the Church.

What it is for
the Pope to
define from
his chair.

Many learned Divines, and Lawyers, do much labour how to make the Popes authority so solide as that whatsoever he shall design *from his chaire* (as they call it) may be altogether, *infallible*. Which if they would understand according to the opinion of some learned Divines, of the Pope sitting and Presiding in a General Council, they might much more easily maintain their own and this true opinion. For who doth not see, that this is the natural power of the head of every Society, to wit; that his commands, or legislative power, is then most absolute, whilst he is united & sitting as President in the representative body of his whole community. Thus a King in his Parliament, in his General States, or in the supreme Senate of his Kingdom is used to enact laws and Statutes.

What the
Pope generally
doe and
will.

Although we do not acknowledge any authority in the Pope given him by *Divine right*, whereby he can make any new articles of Divine and Catholick faith; Nor that we do give that absolute solidity and certainty to his personal definitions, pronounced, I mean, without a General Council, which we do to the universal Churches unanimous consenting. Nevertheless being *Head* and Pastor of the true Church of Christ, and it being not easie to gather Generall Councils, as often as controversies in matters of Religion do usually rise, It is necessary that he should have power in such im-
mergent

mergent occasions, for preventing of Schisme and scandal, to decree with a *canonical* certainty, whatever may be requisit for the quiet of the Church, and the good of Christianity. Vnto whose decrees, duly and juridically given, the whol Church is obliged to acquies, at least untill a General Councel can be called. This truly seems to belong to the Pope out of the innate quality of *Head and Pastor of the Church*. And certainly, it doth not belong to the subject, to resist and withstand at his pleasure, the law, and command of his superior.

The whole Church ow-
erh some kind
of obedience
to the Pope.

Wherefore, the universal Church ought to obey the decrees of the Pope, which many testimonies of the holy Scripture, generall Councils, and antient Fathers, commonly cited by Divines, do strongly certifie. Nor is it needful in my opinion to suppose, that there is a *Divine infallibility* annexed to the Sea of Rome (which all Divines do acknowledge is not certain, as an article of our *Divine and Catholick faith*) since that every Catholick is obliged to confesse, that an obsequious obedience is due unto him. Asthough, forsooth we were not obliged to obey the sentence of the supreme judgment Seat in the Commonwealth, although the judge himself be not free from error by Divine warrant.

The Pope is
to obeyed
though he be
not infallible.

The ground and roote of this obedience due to the Pope juridically decreeing, doth chiefly consist in this, that he is St Peters Successor in the title of head of the Church; And therefore none can doubt, but that all power, and authority befitting this office and dignity, is given him by

The Pope is
St. Peter's suc-
cessor, though
nor in all his
priviledges &
prerogatives.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

Divine right, for the good of the Christian common-wealth, and edification of the Body of Christ. It imports not therefore, whether absolutly all St Peters *infallibility* be given to his Successors by order from Christ, for as this position is in some sence esteemed by many Divines, to have a Theological truth in it, yet is it not an article of our Catholick and Divine faith.

No more are
other Bishops
to the rest of
the Apostles.

All Bishops are Successors of the Apostles ; And the universal Church doth acknowledge, that the Apostles were so confirmed in grace, as that they were altogether *infallible*, and free from all error, in the delivery of Christian Doctrine. Shall we therefore say, that all Bishops are free from error? We certainly hold, that to all the Apostles were revealed heavenly secrets, yea and that it was given unto them by extraordinary and supernatural means, not to be deceived in what was revealed unto them ; Are therefore these priviledges given by Divine warrant, either to the Pope, or to the rest of his Brethren the Bishops? However, we may rightly say, that the Pope in vertue of his being *Head*, can by his juridical authority decide all spiritual quarrels in the Church, and determine all controversies in matters of Religion. But of this subject more hereafter. In the interim we may note, that the common distinction of the Pops erring as a *private Doctor*, and of his defining *infallibility* as Bishop of Rome, is meer Scholastical, and doth not reach to the certainty of our Divine and Catholick faith.

The conclu-
sion of the
first part of
this Treatise.

Hitherto we have treated in common and in General of the nature and of the subject of our
Divine

Divine and Catholick faith; and we have manifestly demonstrated (if I do not mistake) that *universall tradition*, is the true and most certain rule and means, to know the Catholick faith; Into which likewise is to be resolved as into its last principle, in order to us, every assent of Christian faith; That upon this ground, as its chief foundation, is built our belief of the holy Scripture, which we have most evidently convinced, cannot possibly be universally known with certainty to be the Word of God; nor can the true sence and meaning of it, be constantly and unanimously agreed upon by any other means, then by Catholick tradition.

Whence it is manifest again, that this *analysis* or resolution of Christian faith, doth not fall into that *circular labyrinth*, wherein these Divines are generally involved, who doe frame a resolution of faith, according to the common and unexamined opinion of the vulgar. Whom if you ask how they know the Scripture to be the revealed word of God; They answer presently, by the universal consent of the Catholick Church. And if you reply with another interrogation, and ask them, how they know that this unanimous consent of the Catholick Church is not subject to error, but *infallible*; They answer, by the Word of God. And thus not daring build divine faith upon any natural certainty and evidence, they fall inevitably into this circle; And thus dancing in a round, they make Divine faith (which supream reason it self hath framed and delivered) to be unreasonable; And consequently will have ra-

The circle which some Divines fall into in resolving faith.

The certainty of faith ought to be reasonable.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

tional men, whose very nature and essence it is to do all things by judgment and reason, to be more certain in there assents of faith, then reason doth either require or will allow. For there be many Divines, who dare not acknowledge that the arguments, though most strong, and the reasons, though most evident, whereby we demonstrate, that the *universal tradition* of our Divine and Catholick faith, are *solid, free from possibility of error, and infallible*: They dare not, I say, acknowledge, that these arguments do so clearly evince this truth, as that there remaineth no possibility in error; And thence they imagine, that the minds of Christians are left so wavering and uncertain notwithstanding these arguments, considering the huge difficulties of such things as are proposed to our belief, as they stand in need of I know not what particular and invisible instinct; in vertue whereof say they, every assent of Christian faith hath a *Divine and infallible certainty*.

But we cannot think, that the certainty and *infallibility* of Divine faith and Christian Religion in general, can be built, or grounded upon any such flight and imaginary phansie. We acknowledge, as often before, that to every assent of Christian faith, is required an instinct of the holy Ghost, or an internal motion of Gods Divine grace, as it is likewise required to every act of hope and charity, yea and to every act of any supernatural vertue whatsoever: But that the *certainty* of our acts or assents of faith, is to be settled and grounded upon these unknown and invisible motions, which every man may pretend to have when he pleaseth; this

this we constantly deny. We say therefore, that all the *infalibility* and *unerrability*, whereof mans nature is capable, is most clearly and evidently to be had by the means of *universall tradition*. And we have shewed, that the subject of this tradition is so perceptable and notorious, as that every one who hath but eyes, and eares, and lives amongst Catholicks, cannot doubt, but that we professe to believe, all the tenets which we call articles of faith, and that we practise them in the actions of our Religion. For example, that we hold there are seaven Sacraments which are dayly administered throughout all the Catholick Church in the name of the B. Trinity : That the Sacrifice of the Masse is dayly offered by our Priests : That the true and real body of our Saviour Jesus Christ, is every day adored in the Sacrament : That we pray for the dead : That we pray to Saints : That these, I say, and the like, are the tenets and practises of our Catholick faith and Religion, no man of common sense living in a Catholick Country, can doubt of it. All which being equally grounded upon the *universallity of tradition*, as much as this tenet, *that the Scripture is the word of God*, and built likewise thereupon, as upon the only true means of their being conveyed, and communicated from hand to hand ; And this manner of conveyance being *unerrable* (as we have demonstrated) it is impossible but that these tenets and practises should not have been taught and delivered by a continued descent from the Apostles times. And this may suffice for the first part of this small Treatise.

The

The second Book.

Of the particular articles of our Christian and Catholick faith, as they are distinguished from other truths belonging to Christian Religion; and from such tenets as are uncertain, and doubtfully disputed amongst Catholick Divines.

The first Chapter.

Of certain General heads which are to be presupposed for the more accurate examination of particular articles.

Before we come to discusse in particular the several questions about Religion, which are disputed betwixt Catholicks and Hereticks, I thought fit to declare first, certain generall heads, which I conceive will make the way to peace and union much more easie.

What is signified by this word necessary.

First therefore it is to be noted, that since we labour to find out and to specify distinctly and precisely such tenets and articles as are *necessary* to be believed, it is requisite that we explicate this word *necessary*, and that we free it from all equivocal ambiguity. Now we have already distinguished two kinds of *necessity*, in relation to our articles of faith considered in generall, and as in themselves; to wit, either because of the form and

and substance of the article; or by reason of its subject and matter. And we said that the form was equally common to them all; but of their subjects some were much more important, and more fundamentall then others. To this division or distinction we may now add, that amongst these subjects, there be some which we hold and embrace, as convenient for the generall good of the faithful people, but as of lesse *necessity*. And the reason is, because many of the more unlearned and simpler sort of the faithful believers, are perhaps saved by the faith and practise of these helps (as by the invocation of Saints, use of Images and the like) who otherwise would never have been so vertuous, nor consequently been saved. But we do not for the present speak of this kind of *necessity* which neverthelesse we shall hereafter note in every particular article, as occasion shall serve. In the interim we now only enquire after, and treat of that *necessity* of the articles of our Divine faith, which hath relation to their proper nature, and *essentiall form*; So as that whosoever should obstinately deny and oppose the least of them, were presently to be cast ought of the communion of the Catholick Church, as one that would destroy the *formall and essentiall* motive of Christian faith and Religion

The second thing to be noted is, that we are to recall to mind what we have said before concerning the division or distinction of Christian truths; whereof some we said were *Catholick*, which although they are not properly revealed, and therefore cannot be such, as that we may say, we give
an

There be some Catholick truths which are not revealed.

an assent of *Divine* faith unto them (speaking according to the exact propriety of language) yet are they so *Catholick*, and so naturally connexed to Christian Religion, as that whosoever should wilfully reject and impugne any of them, were streight to be branded with the mark of an Heretick, & to be cast out of the society and communion of the Christian and Catholick Church. Of this nature are these positions, that the holy Scripture is the word of God; Asalso, all those things which are written in the holy Scripture, and are delivered by the universal tradition of the whole Church, concerning, the life, miracles, & death of Christ Jesus; And many other things of the same kind. For these truths, though they be not properly revealed by God, yet are they in some sort the ground of all revealed truths, especially that position above mentioned, of the Scripture its being the word of God, and infallibly true. These truths therefore we doe put into the Cathologue of those things which are of *necessity* to be believed. Hence it followeth, that no man is obliged to hold and maintain any tenet or position, though never so common which is not believed and held by all Catholicks whosoever, as an article of our Divine faith, or of *necessity* taken as we declared even now. I say, by all *Catholicks*, that is, no man publicly opposing it, who doth still remain, and is suffered to be in the Communion of the Catholick Church, and to live in its society with the rest of the faithful members of Christ. For what position soever is publicly maintained and defended by any pious and learned Catholick writers, who neither are, in this point

What kind of
tenets are not
Catholicks
obliged to
hold.

point, juridically condemned by the Church, nor excommunicated ; such a position, I say, can never have the nature and quality of a *revealed truth*, or of a *necessary article* of our Divine and Catholick faith.

Hence we may rightly exclude from the Catalogue of such things as are of *necessity* to be believed, whatsoever doth only rely upon the consequences and reasons of Divines. Wherefore we will remit all such truths as are purely Theological (whereof we shall find very few in this age, which are not doubtfully disputed on both sides) unto that Science, as to their proper place. So that we do not only except and exclude from the list of revealed truths, and of *necessary* articles, all such tenets as are indifferently disputed in the schools, but even also those (if there be any such) as all Divines do agree in, as in a Theological truth.

Theological conclusions are excluded out of the catalogue of our articles of faith.

Further we may exclude from this Catalogue of our Catholick and *necessary* articles of faith, the whole body of the Canon law, the decrees, and decretalls, and all other ordinances and answers of Popes of this nature ; whether they be concerning matters of fact, any way belonging to the lives and manners of Christians, exercise of Religion, or the like, Or whether they be constitutions & definitions in doctrine of faith according to the principles which we have already settled, That is, unlesse they be otherwise grounded upon *universall tradition*, For almost all these decrees (except such as are taken out of the Councils made for the condemnation of some

The Canon law is likewise excluded.

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

heretick) do either treat of particular businesses, or have only relation to some speciall province, and therefore cannot in vertue hereof have the nature of *universall tradition*, nor consequently the quality of a *necessary* article of our Divine and Catholick faith.

All Ecclesiastical constitutions are likewise excluded.

To these we may add all Ecclesiastical constitutions made ever since the Apostles times, of what quality, or condition soever they be. All which therefore we do exclude from the Catalogue of those things which are of *necessity* to be believed.

Decrees of Provincial Councils are likewise excluded.

We do not likewise admit into the number of our revealed and *necessary* truths, the definitions and decrees of Provincial Councils, although the Pope himselfe have or should preside in them, unlessse they have as I said before, the universal consent of the whole Church annexed unto them.

All sacred rites and ceremonies, not instituted by Christ, are likewise excluded.

Lastly we exclude and put out of this Catalogue of our revealed and *necessary* truths all the Ceremonies, rights, customes, lawes, and ordinances of the Church; and all practises, formes and manners of Divine service, or sacred functions, which are not of *Divine institution*, and delivered as such by the *universal tradition* of the Catholick Church,

Now let our adversaries consider with what modesty they can so falsely accuse and calumniate us, saying, we daily encrease the number of the articles of our catholick faith; And that we often add to the Catalogue of those points, which we say are of divine institution.

The

The Second Chapter.

That all things contained in the Apostles Creed are necessarily to be believed, as being all of them Catholick truths.

IT is evident out of the principles which we have settled in the precedent Book, and by what we have said in the last Chapter, that there are fewer revealed and Catholick truths of necessity, and whereunto we are obliged to consent with *Divine faith*, then such divines as write of controversies in Religion do commonly imagine. For there be very many who impugn heresies with more zeale then knowledge, and thence do not only hold, and maintain such doubtfull consequences, as are uncertainly disputed in Divinity; but also such opinions as are every where problematically agitated in philosophie; who maintain them, I say, as necessary, for the upholding of our Catholick faith, and Christian Religion. For example, there be some who maintain, as a necessary support of the certainty of Divine faith, that an absolute indifference or rather contingencie, is altogether necessary, to all human actions which have the nature of vertue or vice; because all such actions as are either vertuous or vitious, ought to be the operations of an Agents free-will. Others hold, that the same body or quantity may at the same time fill two distant places, and be commensurable unto them both; because the body of Christ is in a spiritual manner, or as we call it, Sa-

Some Catholics maintain divers natural positions as necessary for the upholding of faith, which truly are not so.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

cramentally at the same time upon many severall Alters. These Divines, (if I mistake not) do much hurt and prejudice our Christian Religion, and the Catholick cause, whilst they labour to defend it.

Errors against
naturall truths
are omitted.

Now we will purposely omit to speak of some heretical errors, which are against the law of nature, against the written law of *Moses*, and even against some other evident truths, which are in some sort the ground of all our supernatural Doctrine. As those who said the rational soul of man is part of the substance of God, which the *Gnostici*, from their author *Carpocrates*, about the year of our Lord Jesus Christ, 129. And the *Priscillianiste*, about the year, 388. Strongly maintained. Others said the soul of man dieth with the body, which after divers Atheists and hereticks, one *Hermannus Rissuich* a Hollander, the most wicked and foolish of men, maintained about the year, 1460. And this unfortunate miscreant, did choose rather to be burnt alive for the maintenance of this error (besids other filthy tenets and blasphemies) then to abjure and detest it. These, I say, and many such like errors, I will here omit, intending only at the present, to mark out distinctly the revealed and Catholick truths of our Christian Religion, and their opposit errors. Yet we may note by the way that their is not either any precept of Decalogue, or any truth, though never so evident by the light of reason, which some wicked and perverse hereticks have not opposed and denied. Whence it is manifest, how ridiculous and foolish it is to think (which some
Schif-

Schismaticks of these times do imagine) that whatsoever was at any time called in doubt, or hath been asserted by any *Apostata* and his followers (though condemned and anathematized for it by the Church) may be freely and boldly maintained and the opposit to it, may be justly held for uncertain.

Further we are to note, that there is nothing contained in the *Nicene and Athanasian* creeds, but what is in the Apostles creed, though the expression of the same truth, is more succinct in this, and more ample in the other. Wherefore they are both received and acknowledged by the Catholick Church, as containing our revealed and Catholick Doctrine. There is a clause or two in them, which we will examine hereafter.

Nothing in the *Nicene* and *Athanasian* Creeds which is not in the Apostles Creed.

If we look upon the exact property of words and speech, this truth *that there is a God*, is rather a preamble to our Divine and Catholick faith, then an article of our faith. For it is impossible that we should give our assent to any tenet or position, because God hath said it, or for the authority of God revealing it (which is the very *essence* of an assent to an article of faith) unlesse we first suppose that there is a God. Neither can we adhear to this truth, *There is a God*, because God hath said it, or revealed it unto us. For these termes are incompatible and destructive of each other. Wherefore, we must first presuppose, as a truth manifest of it self by the light of reason, and rooted in the hearts of men with most evident arguments and convincing experiences, the first words of our creed, *That there is a God*, or, which is the

That there is a God is a preamble to faith.

That there is a God.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

God is the
Creator of
Heaven and
Earth.

same, that there is a first cause,

In him we ought to believe, and professe him to be the *Creator of heaven and of earth*. That is, that he made and framed the whole world, and what ever hath a *being* out of himself of nothing. And this against the impertinent imaginations of some antient hereticks, of whom the first after Christ was, *Simon Magnus*, who is said to have denied it. Which afterwards *Carpocrates* taught, as we find him cited by *S. Ireneus*, *Epiphanius*, *Theodoretus*; and confuted by the same *Ireneus* and *Tertullian* (from him came the hereticks called *Carpocratiani* and *Gnostici*) about the year, 129. This man said, the world was created by the Angels. *Marcion* (whom *S. Polycarpe* called the eldest Son of the Diel) about the year, 155. said, there were two Gods, a good one, and a bad one, And that the world was created by the bad God and that even in his wrath. This heresie of *Marcion*, is cited by *S. Ireneus*, and by *S. Epiphanius*; and confuted (as *Philastrius* saith) by the Priests of *Ephesus*. The same said the *Cathari*, about the year 256. who were condemned with some others by *Gregory* the 9. and by *Pope Alexander*, in the Council of *Lateran*. The same said the *Manichai*, about the year, 273. whom all men know were refuted by divers of the holy Fathers and Popes. The *Catharista* were of the same opinion with the *Cathari*, about the year 279. The *Priscilliani*, about the year, 388. said the same, and were refuted by *S. Ambrose*, *S. Austin*, and *S. Leo*. And their heresie was condemned by the Council of *Bracara*, and by the Council of *Saragosa*.

The

The *Albanenses*, about the year, 796. were condemned by the Council of *Meana*. These hereticks besides these errors, did renew divers others which had been condemned in the second Council of *Nice*, and by the Synode of *Trulla*, that is, of *Constantinople*; called *Trulla*, because it was held in the *Sacristie* of the Palace, which was made in a round forme as a *Dome* or *cuppula*. Others said that God had a humane forme or shape, as *Vadius* the author of the *Anthromorphits*, about the year, 395. he is cited by *S. Epiphanius*: their heresie was condemned in the Councils of *Laodicea*, *Gangra*, and *Antioche*, and by the Bishop of *Verona*. *Bogomiles* about the year 1179. (who is said to have been burnt by *Alexius* the Emperor of *Constantinople*) and his leader, one *Basilus*, cited by *Euthymius*; their errors were condemned by Pope *Pascal* in the Council of *Lateran*. All these men did affirm God to be author of sin, which our Catholick faith did alwaies abhor and condemn. As it was indeed condemned against *Fortunatus*, who was convinced by *S. Austin* about the year, 405. And against *Luther*, about the year, 1537. (who acknowledged that *Simon Magus* was of his opinion.) And against *Cacangelici* in the year, 1655. And against the *Libertini*, whom *Calvin* himself condemned in some other things.

As the Divine and Catholick faith of this creed doth teach us to adore this only God, one in Substance or essence; So doth it likewise teach us to professe that, there are three persons in this God-head. Against this sacred *Trinity* of persons in God, divers hereticks have exclaimed: Some have denied

The Trinity of persons in God is to be believed.

denied the *Trinity* in common, that is, in the general motion of a *Trinity*. Others have said that the *hypostasis* or *personality* of the Son could not consist distinctly in him with the identitie of the *Diety* or *Godhead*. Others have denied both the *Divinity* and the *personality* of the holy Ghost; whercof we will alleage some of every sort.

Origenes did oppose the *Trinity* in general, about the year 207. as *S Epiphanius* doth remark in his Epistle to the Bishop of *Hierusalem*, imagining that there is some inequality betwixt the persons of the *Son*, and of the *holy Ghost*, compared to God the Father. *Origen* his errors are cited by *St. Hierome*, and by the fifth general Council. *Nortius*, and more boldly his Disciple *Sabellius*, about the year, 260. (against whom, as also against *Arrius*, *St. Athanasius* made his creed, and from whom afterwards, came the *Patropassians*) did impudently affirm, that there is but only one person in God called by three names; And therefore *Sabellius* was condemned together with *Arrius* in the first Council of *Nice*, consisting of 318. Bishops; And in the Councils of *Sirmium* and *Alexandria* *Hermogenes*, companion to *Sabellius*, refuted by *Tertullian*, and before him by *St. Justine*, together with the *Praxeans*, who were condemned by Pope *Zevevinus*, about the same time, did maintain the same error. *Photinus* Bishop of *Firmo* and disciple to *Paulus Samosatanius*, about the year 340. said that God was single, that is, so one, as that neither the *word* nor the *holy Ghost*, were a person. He was condemned, with *Sabellius* and *Arrius*, in the first Council of *Nice*, by 318. Bishops;
And

And in the second Council of *Rome*, consisting of 275. Bishops; And in the Council of *Sardis*, about the year, 347. And in the general Council of *Constantinople*, *Amatius*, otherwise called *Palladius*, about the year, 381. together with *Polycronius*, *Asclepiades*, and other *Arrian* Bishops did impugn the *Trinity*, and were condemned with *Secundus*, by the first Council of *Nice*, under Pope *Silvester*, And by the Council of *Aquileia* under Pope *Damasus*. The *Priscillans*, condemned as above, did follow *Noetius* and *Sabellius*, about the year 388. *Olipius* Bishop of *Carthage*, about the year, 395. is said to have perished miserably, being burnt with three fiery thunderbolts, visibly darted upon him by an Angel, whilst he was blaspheming the *Holy Trinity* in the baths. The *Jacobites* about the year 595. (so called from *Jacobus Cyrus*, cited by *Nicephorus*) and who were condemned by the second Council of *Macon*, by the second Council of *Agatha*, and by the first Council of *Orleans*; did acknowledge the unity of God, but denied the *Trinity*. *Johannes Philoponus*, the subtle philosopher, and ringleader of the *Tritheists* about the year, 605. cited by *Nicephorus*, and confuted by *Leontius*, did on the contrary side affirm, that there is not only three persons in God, but also three *natures*, as in three several men; and therefore said, there are *three Gods*. *Mahomet*, the true *Antichrist*, about the year 630. did all he could to divulge this error, and impugned the *B. Trinity* with might and main, as he did also divers other chiefe tenets of our Christian faith and Religion. Whose impieties have been confuted by *Ricoldus*, by *Pius Secundus*,

by *Bartholomeus Hungarus* and others. The *Agareni* followers of *Sabellius*, who were called *Semichristiani*, halfe-Christians, about the year 650. embraced their Masters Doctrine. *Michaill Servetus*, Calvins companion, about the year, 1538. maintained that there is one only person in God, who at *Calvins* solicitation, was therefore put to death in *Geneva*, *Jo: Campanus*, *Matt: Illericus*, and many other latter hereticks, have absolutely denyed the distinction of persons in God. To whom we may lawfully add *Calvin* himself, for although sometimes he seems to speak otherwise; yet in effect he could not indure the name of *Trinity*. But divers of our latter hereticks, as *Lucas Sterneberger* and others, have rayled and uttered most horrible blasphemies against the *Trinity*; some of them called it a *woeman*; others, the *three headed Cerberus*, and the like.

The incarnation of the second person in the Trinity is to be believed.

Against the *Incarnation* of God, or *Diety* of *Jesus Christ*, divers hereticks have vomited forth their poyson, which neverthelesse the Catholick Church hath ever believed with an universal and Divine faith. The *Cerinthie*, cited by *S. Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Dionisius Alexandrinus*, *Epiphanius*, *Augustinus*; and refuted by *S. Clement*, by *S. Dionisius*, *Areo*, *Pagita*, by *S. Ignatius*, and by *S. Martiall*. The *Ebionæi*, cited also by *S. Irenæus*, and by *S. Epiphanius*, and refuted by *S. Ignatius*, by *S. Polycarpe*, and by *S. Martiall*. There were also divers others in the very time of the Apostles, who did oppose Christs *Incarnation*, saying, that he was not truly *God incarnate*; against whom *S. John* is said to have written his *Divine Gospell*.

Caro

Carpocrates, cited and refuted as above, about the year 129. and his Disciples said, that Christ was only man, and not God, begotten by *Joseph* as other men are. A certain heretick called *Bassus*, otherwise *Color Bassus*, disciple of one *Marcus*, who is cited by *St. Ireneus*, by *Epiphanius*, and by *St. Austin*, and refuted by the same *St. Ireneus*, and *St. Justin*, about the year 150. *Arthemion* about the year 221. with *Theodotus* the Tanner, and one *Montanus*, were in the same error. *Arthemion* and *Theodotus* are cited by *Tertullian*, by *Eusebius*, by *Theodoretus*, and by *Hicephorus*. This *Theodotus* was excommunicated by *S. Victor* the Pope; and the *Montanists*, who were so called from this *Montanus*, were those hereticks, whom others call *Cataphryges*, and *Encratites*, and *Talians*, all commonly cited by the ancient Fathers, and cast out of the Church by *Zenerinus* the Pope, and were confuted by *Anthenagoras*, by *Serapion*, by *Anicetus*, and others. *Paulus Samosatanns*, about the year 273. taught the same doctrine, and therefore was condemned by the Councell of *Antioch* in the year 274. *Arrius*, that famous, or rather infamous Priest of *Alexandria*, about the year 315. said that Jesus Christ was the Sonne of God, in as much as he was like unto him, but that he was not *consubstantiall* with him; and therefore was condemned with *Sabellus* by the first Councell of *Nice*, about the same time; and afterwards by the first Councell of *Rome*, consisting of 275 Bishops, about the yeere 320. And after that again by the second Councell of *Rome*, consisting of 116 Bishops about the year 342. In which Councell, the de-

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

crees of the first councell of *Nice* were confirmed. *Photinus*, as before, about the year 340 said likewise, Christ was onely man, and not God, and therefore was condemned as above. *Marcellus* Bishop of *Ancyra*, who lived about the same time, said likewise, Christ was onely man, and therefore was condemned by the General Council of *Constantinople*, *Eufhratas* maintained the same, and was condemned by the Council of *Colone* in the year 346. *Apolinaris*, cited by both the *St. Gregories*, *Niscene* and *Naziansene*, *St. Epiphanius*, by *St. Austin*, and by *Damasceus*, about the year 377. did imagine that Christ, as God, did take and assume unto him a humane body, but not a rational soul, whose function he conceited his Divinity did supply. *Nestorius*, Bishop of *Constantinople* about the year, 427. said, that Christ at the first was only man, born of the B. Virgin, so that she was the Mother of Christ, but not the Mother of God; because his Godhead was conjoyned and united unto him after he was born, and therefore he said, there was not onely two *natures*, but also two *persons* in Christ; he is cited by *S. Theodoret* and *S. Prosper*, and was condemned by the third General Council of *Ephesus*, in which *Cyril* did sit as president about the year, 428. *Eutyches*, an Abbot of *Constantinople*, about the year, 443. on the contrary denied that there were two *natures* in Christ, and therefore was condemned with *Dioscorus* his disciple by the General Council of *Chalcedon*, consisting of 630. Bishops, about the year, 457. And was afterwards condemned with *Nestorius* as above in the fifth Council of *Orleans*, about the year, 567.

Macha-

Maccharius Bishop of *Antioche*, head of the *Mono-*
thelites, about the year, 559. denied there was a-
ny *human will*, nor consequently any *human nature*
in *Christ*, and therefore was condemned by the
General council of *Constantinople*, consisting of 170
Bishops, about the year 700. The *Jacobite* professed
the same doctrine about the year 584. *Sergius*, *Pir-*
hus & *Paulus*, Patriarchs of *Constantinople*, And *Cyrus*
Bish. of *Alexandria*, who were all *Monothelites*, about
the year 604. did confound the two natutes in
Christ, and were therefore condemned in the first
Council of *Lateran* about the yeer 650, *Felix Urge-*
litinus, & *Elipandus* Bishop of *Toledo*, about the year,
730. were condemned by Pope *Adrian*, by the
Council of *Francford*, and by the Bishops of *France*
for saying that *Christ* was only the adoptive Son
of God, and yet they said withall, that there
were two *Hypostates* or *persons* in *Christ*. These,
and divers others, especially since the heresies of
Luther and *Calvin* (whom it would be too long
and tedious to cite) have broched and maintai-
ned most wicked opinions of the *Diet*, and *Incar-*
nation of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, and have been
therefore condemned by the Catholick church, so
soon as ever they came to be publick. There have
been also very many of the same trampe who
have fowly erred, and spoken blasphemiously a-
gainst the sacred humanity of our Saviour *Christ*,
whom we shall have occasion to cite hereafter.

There have been likewise many hereticks, be-
sides those whom we have already cited, who
have denied both the *Divinity*, and the *Personality*
of the *holy Ghost*, The *Melchisedichians* refuted

The Divinity
and personali-
ty of the holy
Ghost is to be
believed.

by

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

by *Tertullian*, about the year 240. as *S. Austin* telleth us, thought that *Melchisedec* was the holy Ghost. The *Abstinentes*, about the year 289. said the holy Ghost was made and therefore not God. *Eustathius* Bishop of *Sebastea*, about the year 320. condemned by the Council of *Gangra*, because he refused to profess the holy Ghost to be God. *Photinus* did not only deny the *Trinity* (as we have noted already) but particularly denied the holy Ghost to be a *Divine person*. The *Semiarrians*, about the year, 351. said, the holy Ghost was neither God nor of a *Divine substance*, but made and created. *Majorinus* Bishop of *Carthage*, and the *Rogatiani* (as *S. Austin* saith) about the year, 358. said, that the holy Ghost is lesse then the Son. The *Pneumatomachi*, about the year 359. were divers Bishops (whereof *Eustatius*, whom we cited but now, was one) who together with *Macedonius*, did deny, that the holy Ghost was one of the persons of the *Trinity*, who were therefore condemned in the Council of *Constantinople*. *Airas*, about the year, 377. did impugne the *consubstantialitie* of the holy Ghost; And with him sided *Fauftus*, *Cleopater*, *Polycronius*, *Thelemanus*, and divers others *Arrien* Bishops, who were condemned in the Council of *Rome* under *Liberius* the Pope. *Macedonius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, cited already, denying the *consubstantialitie* of the holy Ghost with the Father and the Son, and saying he was only a pure creature, was condemned by the second General Council of *Constantinople*, consisting of 180. Bishops about the year, 383. *Actius*, as also *Eunomius*, confuted by *S. Athanasius*,
by

by S. *Basil*, S. *Epiphanius*, by S. *Ambrose*, by S. *Austin*, by S. *Cyril*, as they put an equality betwixt the *Father* and the *Son*, so did they likewise betwixt the *Son* and the holy Ghost. The *Agareni*, as above, about the year, 640. said, they might well deny that to the *holy Ghost*, which they had denyed to the *Son*. *Michael Servetus*, as above, would not acknowledge the holy Ghost to be a person in God. The *Deists*, who were also called *Trinitarians*, would not allow the holy Ghost, either any *Deity*, or any personality. These and many other later hereticks have vomited out their blasphemies in abundance against the holy Ghost. Some there have been, who have said, that they themselves were the holy Ghost; others, that they had the holy Ghost in them; yea, there was one *Adeiphus* who imagined that, by only prayer, the holy Ghost came visibly into man, that he was felt and seen, and wrought many such like sensible and corporal miracles in them, not distinguishing betwixt the *grace* of the holy Ghost (which produceth all that is good in man) and the *substance* of the holy Ghost himself.

That *Christ* was conceived by the *Holy Ghost*, that is, that the *Incarnation* of the second person in God, was a particular effect of the Divine love, hath ever been believed by the Catholick church, which almost all the hereticks already cited, and divers others have denied; but more expressly the *Abstinentes*, about the year 289. and the *Semiarians*, about the year 357. As also those who refused to acknowledge, that the third person of the *Trinity* is *consubstantiall* to the *Father* and

Christ conceived by the Holy Ghost.

Born of the
Virgin Mary.

and the Sonne, whom we have already cited.

That *Christ was born of the Virgin Mary*, no no Catholick doth doubt of it; yet hath there been divers hereticall errors in this point, which may be all reduced to two heads. First, of those who denied that Christ was born of the *Virgin Mary*: the second of those, who said that Christs mother, to wit, *Mary Josephs Spouse*, was no *virgin*. In both these points have erred all those, who have been enemies to, and unbelievers of the *Incarnation*. As also, besides those whom we have already cited, the *Appellitæ*, (so called from *Appelles*, disciple of *Marcion*) about the yeer 178. saying, that Christ did not take flesh of his mother, but from the elements. These we finde cited by *Tertullian*, by *S. Epiphanius*, by *S. Austin*, and by *S. Damascene*, and confuted by *S. Justin*, *S. Ireneus*, by *Tertullian*, and by *Soter Pope*. *Julianus Halicarnassæus*, refuted by *Euagrius* and *Damasceus*, said the body of Christ was created immortall and impassible. *Apolinaris* said, the flesh of Christ was not taken from the Virgin, but descended from Heaven. *Sisimus* said the same, about the yeere 458. *Timothæus* about the yeere 477. said the like, and many others. In the second point have erred the *Antimariani* about the yeer 396. whose ringleader *Jovinianus* (cited by *S. Austin*, & condemned by the Councel of *Telepte*) and *Heluidius*, confuted by *S. Hierom*, and *S. Austin*, said the *B. Virgin*, after the birth of Christ, had other Sons by *Joseph Henriciani*, so called from one *Henrie* a certain Monke, whom *S. Bernard* confuted, about the year 1128. And many others of latter

latter times, but above all one *Lucas Sternebergor* (whom we have already cited) about the year, 1561. saying the B. Virgin had three or four Sons before our saviour was born.

That *Christ suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried*, is so expressly related in the *Gospel*, that one would hardly believe any man should doubt of it, who doth make profession to believe the Scripture. Yet there have been hereticks, who have denied every one of these heads ; And those so many, that it should be two tedious to cite them all, that Christ could neither *suffer* nor be *crucified* was the opinion of *Julianus Halicarnassens*, about the year, 542. as we have noted above : And with him agreed all those, who said the body of Christ was *impassible* from the first moment of his conception. And in the same error were all those, who thought Christ took not his flesh from the Virgin. As also, all those who said Christs body was but a *phantaticall* one, and not a true and reall one ; for said they, though it bear with it the shape and form of a body, yet in effect it was a *phantome* or Ghost ; so that they believed, that Christ was neither *born*, nor *died*, nor truly had any flesh at all. The *Aganeri*, about the year, 650. denied that Christ was put to death, or was *crucified* by the Jewes ; which some of the *Manicheans* affirmed also. And finally some there have been, who have said, that it was not Christ who suffered, and was put to death, but another man whom the Jews hanged in his place. And all these hereticks did generally think, that Christ was nei-

Suffered. crucified and buried.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

ther buried, nor rise again from the dead.

Descended
into hell.

That *Christ descended into hell*, that is, that Christ did in some sort visit the souls of the dead, and delivered some of them from that state and condition wherein they were detained, hath ever been the belief of the Catholick Church. Yet many of those hereticks, whom we have already cited, have denied this article, being their other errors, concerning the nature of Christs body did force them to fall into this negative. *Calvin* did most imprudently blaspheme, saying, that Christ did suffer the pains of hell. And yet more impudently did a certain *Pra nonstratenfis Apostata* Monke (a most horrid thing to be spoken) Sacrilegiously affirm, that Christ upon the Crosse did despair, and was damned for ever.

Rise from the
dead.

That *Christ did rise from the dead*, that is, that Christ his body revived out of the Sepulcher, and was reunited to his soul, and did dwell upon earth for the space of forty daies, no true Catholick did ever doubt. This the *Interimite*, certain *Semilutherans* did deny about the year 1548. affirming, that Christ is not yet risen from the dead; and *Sterneberger* whom we have cited already, said, Christ never did any miracles, nor was as yet risen from the dead.

Ascended into
Heaven.

That *Christ is ascended into the heavens*, that is, That Christ was lifted up above all the visible cloudes, every true and faithful Christian doth believe. Yet there have been divers hereticks, besides those who were involved in the errors already cited, and thence forced to maintain this also; as the *Apellite*, about the year, 178. saying, that

that Christ ascended into heaven, but without either human flesh or Body.

That *Christ doth sit at the right hand of the Father*; that is, that Christ, though truly man, is constituted in power and dignity equall to his father, hath alwaies been an article of our Christian and Catholick faith. Yet hath it been denied by all those who neither would acknowledge his *resurrection*, nor his *ascension*. As also, by the *Seleuciani*, and *Herminiani*, confuted by S. *Basil*, and both the S. *Gregories*, *Nissene*, and *Nazianzene*, (from whom sprung the *Massilians*,) these about the year 280. did particularly deny this article. Sitteth at the right hand of God the father.

That *Christ shall come again to judge the quick and the dead*, no Catholick did ever doubt; which nevertheless many hereticks have denied. The *Borboriani*, otherwise called *Castodigi*, about the year 129. The *Floriani* about the year 382. And the *Proclianiæ*, about the same time; And *Symachus Ebionita*, about the year 196. The *Manicheens* about the year 273. *Samaritanus*, and *Dinantus*, about the year 1204. *Dulcinus* about the year 1309. All these professed, they neither hoped for Christs coming as Judge, nor did they believe, there is any general judgment to come. That he shall come again to judge all the world.

To believe in the *Holy Ghost*, hath ever been the profession of the Catholick church, and that according to the doctrine which we have already set down concerning the holy Ghost; where we likewise cited the errors of the Hereticks, against the Catholick faith in this point. We must believe in the holy Ghost.

The *holy Catholick Church* hath ever been believed by all true Christians, to wit, That there is We must believe in the Catholick Church.

1 Tim. 3.

such a Church, and that it will last to the end of the world, as we have demonstrated in the precedent Book. That *this Church is a Pillar and ground of truth*; That to this Church we owe obedience; and who will not obey it, *let him be unto thee like a heathen and publican*; That to the Pastors and Governors of this Church, Christ hath given power to make laws and constitutions, for the good of the whole Body or Society, and to abrogate the same, according to the several exigences of divers times, places, and other circumstances (never touching, but still leaving entire what Christ hath instituted) unto which laws duely enacted, and universally received, all the subjects of the Church are bound to submit. Whence it is, that there is an *Hierarchicall Government* in the Church, instituted by *Divine right*, under which it is necessary, for the attaining of eternall salvation, for all Christians (generally speaking) to live and to be united thereunto, as a member of the same body, to wit, in the profession and practise of the same evangelicall law: for whosoever doth not live under this Government, at least in preperation of mind; or doth not believe & practise the same doctrine, the same Sacraments, and use all the other means, which are universally used & held by the Rectors of the same Church, as Divine and Catholick. but doth wilfully resist and oppose them, knowing that they are held and practised by all Catholicks as revealed and Christian truths and institutions; This man, I say, who doth thus obstinately withstand these things duely proposed unto him, doth

not

not believe the holy Catholick Church, in that sence and meaning, in which the universal Church, hath ever understood this article. Wherefore it is a point of our Christian and Catholick faith, to believe that to the Pastors of the Church, is given by *Divine right and institution*, a power to govern the faithful people, in relation to the observance of the Evangelical law. And what soever is truly needful and convenient to this effect, it is lawful for the Governors of this Society, to ordain it; to whom likewise their subjects are mutually obliged to obey.

This Catholick truth hath been opposed by almost all heretick. Some have said that only the *Elect or Predestinate* are the Church; which is directly contrary to many expresse passages of holy Scripture. Those were certaine called *Cataphryge* (whom we have already cited about the yeare 181. who were ever reviling and calumniating the Catholique Church. *Donatus* refuted by *St. Austin*, and condemned by the Council of *Rome*, and by *Melchiades* the Pope, about the yeare 358. said that the Church was onely in *Africa*, and that those were onely of the Church who sided with him; which error the *Fratricelli* did renew about the yeare 1276. who were condemned by Pope *Boniface*, and by the Council of *Vienne*. These added unto the former error, that *they themselves* were onely perfect, as being immediately taught by Christ, and therefore were not bound to obey any man. *Jovinianus* said there

The opinion
of the here-
ticks concern-
ing the
Church.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

there was no power in the Church to make laws, or to ordain any thing. The *Albanenses* about the year, 796. said, the Church had lost all the authority which was naturally due unto her, through the vicious lives of her Prelates. A certain heretick called *Petrus Iohannis*, cited by *Guido* the Carmelite, and by *Bernard* of *Lutzelbourg*, and condemned by the Council of *Vienne* under *Clement* the fifth, about the year, 1191. said, the Catholick Church was that *Babylon* which is mentioned in the *Apocalypse*. *Bartholomæus Iauovesius*, about the year, 1363. said, the whole Church was to be accounted as consisting of *Jewes*, and *Infidels*, as well as of *Christians*. *John Huss*, about the year, 1377. would have none but Godly men to be of the Church; he was condemned by the Council of *Constance*. *John Roeseana*, about the year, 1430. followed *Huss* his doctrine. *Luther* about the year, 1517. said that wicked men were not of the Church. *Scissellus* about the year, 1525. boasted, that he had dayly revelations, and that he was the man who must reform and restore the forlorne and ruined State of the Church.

John Westphalus, about the year 1523. said, there is no such certainty in the authority of the universall Church, but that it might erre even in matters of faith. Finally, all our late *Secretaries* have ever hated and inveyed against the Churches authority, as being indeed their chiefe ruine. There have been likewise divers Hereticks, who being ever mortall enemies to the *Hierarchy* of the Church, and proudly opposing the supreme power

power of the Pope, and the subordination of Ecclesiasticall government, have maintained that the authority of all Bishops and Priests were equal. Yea, some have said that *women* ought to be made Priests; and that all sorts of laymen, and all manner of women, might as well as men be consecrated Priests, say Masse, Preach, Govern, and undertake all Ecclesiasticall Functions.

That there is a *communion of Saints*, the Catholick church hath ever acknowledged, which doth consist in the mutuall communication of spirituall goods and graces to each other; And this *communion* amongst the more godly and perfect members of the militant Church, as in their united prayers, pious conversations, mutuall good works, and reciprocall spirituall assistance of each other. As also, in recommending themselves to, and receiving helps by the prayers and intercessions of the blessed Spirits of the triumphant Church, whose fellow Citizens they hope to be one day. There were certain hereticks called *Libertini*, who perversely and impertinently inrerpreted this *communion of Saints*, of the communication of temporall riches and fortunes; and therefore perswaded every man to rape and serape together by hook and crook all that ever he could. But of these we shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

The communion of Saints.

That there is a *Remission or forgiveness of sinnes*, by the merits, and by the death and passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, no true Christian ought to doubt. Which, how it is to be understood,

The remission of sins.

we

we shall declare when we come to speak of the Sacrament of *penance*. The *Novatiani*, so called from *Novatus* and *Novatianus*, cited by *Eusebius* and *S. Epiphanius*, by *S. Austin*, by *Theodoret*, by *Socrates*, and others (it was the followers of these hereticks, who made the first Schisme in the Roman Church against *Cornelius* the Pope; *Novatus* was condemned by the first Council of *Rome*; And *Novatianus* was refuted by *S. Cyprian* by *Dionicius Alexandrinus*, and by *Zenon*) These men about the year, 255, said, that sins committed after Baptisme, could never be forgiven or remitted.

The resur-
rection of the
flesh.

That there is to be a *resurrection of the flesh*, the Catholick Church hath alwaies most undoubtedly taught; to wit, that every particular man, and person of mankind, shall at the last judgment day, resume and take again his own proper and individuall body. There have been many hereticks who have impugned this article: The *Saducei*, *Simon Magus*, (whom *S. Ireneus* citeth) together with his disciples; *Menander*, *Saturninus* and *Basilides*, about the year, 52. who were refuted by *S. Ignatius*, *S. Martial*, *S. Justin*, *Tertullian*, *S. Epiphanius*, *Theodoretus*, and *Dositheus*. After them *Carpocrates*, about the year, 129. *Colorbassus*, about the year, 152. And about the same time, *Valentinus*, (refuted by *Tertullian*, by *S. Epiphanius*, by *S. Clemens Alexandrinus*) and *Cerdon*, condemned by Pope *Higinus*. The *Arcontici* about the year, 160. (refuted by *Tertullian*, by *S. Ireneus*, and by *Theophilactus*) and *Florinus* and *Blastus*, about the year, 182. (refuted by *S. Ire-*
neus)

news) and with them about the same time, the *Procleanita*. The *Caiani*, about the year 195. refuted by S. *Iustin*, and by S. *Epiphanius*. The *Hierarchita* about the year, 279. cited by S. *Epiphanius*, S. *Iustin*, and S. *Hilarius*; and confuted by S. *Hypolitus*, and S. *Cyprian*. The *Severiani*, so called from one *Severus*, condemned together with *Anthymus*, *Iba*, and *Petrus Gnaffaus* Bishop of *Antioche*, about the year, 470. by the first Council of *Constantinople*, consisting of 165. Bishops, and by *Felix* the Pope. This *Petrus* said there was a fourth person in the B. *Trinity*, and therefore put into the preface of the *Massé*, those words, *who was crucified*. The *Albigenses*, about the year, 795. said the same, and were condemned by the Bishop of *Lions*. *Michael Balbus*; the Emperor was in this error, about the year, 824. Besides many others both antient and modern hereticks, who as every man knows that hath any acquaintance in Ecclesiasticall history, have been condemned by the Church in their several ages respectively.

That there is a future *life everlasting*, all Catholics do professe, and hope for a happy one. Which is, that there is an eternity of infinite bliss and happinesse prepared for the elect and Saints of God, who have led a pious and Godly life in this world: And that there is likewise an eternity of infinite woe and misery for such reprobate and foolish men, as void of all true charity, have preferred the vain & transitory pleasures of this momentary life, before the ineffable goodnesse of our omnipotent and most merciful Lord and

Life everlasting.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

Redeemer. This article is denied by all those, who either do not acknowledge there is a God, or that the rational soul of man is immortal; whereof there have ever been too many, especially in these latter times. The *Saducees*, would not acknowledge any future eternity, nor the *Essai*. The *Cerinthæi* said, that after the resurrection, the Kingdome of Christ would be temporal and terrestrial, abounding with all possible lust, and concupiscence, and pleasures of that nature. Whom the *Millenarians*, otherwise called the *Chilastæ*, cited and refuted by *Dionisius Alexandrinus*, and by *Eusebius*, did in some sort follow. The *Bardasamistæ*, about the year, 163. So called from *Bardasanes*, refuted by *S. Iustin*, and by *S. Irenæus*, did deny that there was any future life at all, after this present being. The *Albigenses*, about the year, 796. said that Hell was nothing, which afterwards, the *Præmonstratensis* Monke, whom we have already cited, maintained likewise *Hermannus Pichnich*, cited above, about the year, 1499. *David Georgius* about the year, 1523. And many other hereticks, have been in this error.

Hence we may conclude, that there is no article of our Christian faith, of what moment and importance soever, yea and though contained in the Apostles Creed, but hath been denied and opposed in almost every other age, by some heretick and his followers, and who therefore have been condemned by the Church, in their several times respectively, which the schismaticks of our age might reflect upon, if they pleased, and

con-

No article of
faith which
some hereticks
have not de-
nyed

confider how ridiculous it is to imagine, that there is nothing of *necessity*, to be believed, but what hath been alwaies, and in all places acknowledged, and professed by all Christians whatsoever, even to a man. Infomuch, that no article of Christian doctrine, of what quality soever, ought to be universally exacted, as *necessary* to be believed by every individual man, who shall come to know of it, if ever heretofore it hath been denied by some man and his followers, who acknowledged themselves Christians. This assertion, I say, if true, would clearly destroy Christianity.

We noted in the beginning of this Chapter, that there were certain clauses, or superadded positions in the *Nisene* and *Athanasian* Creeds, which were not expressly mentioned in the Apostles Creed; which we thought fit to declare in this place.

The superadded clauses in the Nicene Athanasian Creeds are here explained.

In the Nicene Creed there be these words, *God from God, light from light, true God from true God, begotten not made*, which emphatical reduplication of speech, is nothing else but a more accurate explication of the self same truth, which is *implicitly* in the Apostles Creed. Although *Calvin* with his accustomed *impudence*, doth call this manner of speech, *a ridiculous repetition*.

There be also these words, *consubstantial to the Father* which although they were expressly to confound the *Arrian* heresie, yet in effect it is but the same sense, and the same signified truth, which is in those words of the Apostles Creed, *His only Son*.

Ee 2

That

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

That which is likewise more formally expressed in the *Nicene Creed* concerning the Diety of the holy Ghost, and of his equality with the father and the Son, is also contained, though not so clearly, in the *Apostles Creed*, as we have shewed above in the explication of these words, *conceived of the holy Ghost*.

These words *who proceedeth from the father and the son*, did seem to the Council to be a more exact, and expresse form of speech, then that of the Greeks, to wit, *who proceedeth from the father by the son*. Although indeed, their difference consists rather in words, then in substance, but that there was some fear of a Sinister intention in the hereticks, who laboured to take away the belief of the Diety of the holy Ghost; which the fathers of the Council suspected, and perhaps were certain of; and therefore added those words.

To these words of the *Apostles Creed*, the *Catholick Church*, was added this word *Apostolike*, for the better clearing of the nature and Source of our Christian and Catholick Church.

These words, *I believe one Baptism for the remission of sins*, which are in the *Nicene Creed*, and not in the *Apostles Creed*, we shall have occasion to explain them whom we come to treat of the Sacrament of *Baptism*, and of original sin.

In fine, we see that the whole Creed of *S. Athanasius*, is nothing else but an exquisite and ample explication of the Mysteries of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, according to the universal, & Catholick sense, and belief of the Church. There is in the end of his Creed, these words; *That every man is to give*

an account of his own works, and those that have done well, shall go into life everlasting, but those that have done evil, into eternal fire. Which although it be directly and expressly signified in the Scriptures, and that in several places, yet because there have been, and are still some hereticks which deny it, we will treat of this subject, and declare the truth of it, in its proper place.

I may suppose, it is not needful to add the revealed and Catholick belief of the universal Church, touching the visible *Mission of the holy Ghost*, to wit *when* (after the resurrection of Christ) *the fifty days were accomplished, the holy Ghost did visibly descend upon his disciples gathered peaceably together in one place*, as is expressed *Act. 2*, for although there have been hereticks, who have denied this mystery, yea and who have derided it also; yet, supposing the truth of the holy text, and of our Christian Religion, we must necessarily maintain, that this divine and stupendous manner of establishing our Evangelical Law, was performed in that manner, as it is there prescribed.

The sending
of the holy
Ghost ought
to be believed

The

The third Chapter.

*What is of necessity to be believed of the holy
Scriptures, of General Councils, and
of the Pope.*

The first Paragraph.

*What is of necessity to be believed of the
holy Scriptures.*

FROM what we have said in the precedent Book of these three points in general, it will not be hard to determine what is of *necessity* to be believed of every one in particular.

1. First, That there is a *holy Scripture*, or revealed written word of God (which, what it is, we have defined and declared above) is of *necessity* to be believed as an Article of our Catholick faith; nor is it any wayes lawful for a Christian to doubt of it.
2. Secondly, That all those books which by the universal consent of the whole Catholick Church have been put into the *Canon*, are and ought to be received as *Canonical*.
3. Thirdly, That we have not the same certainty of the Authors of these writings, which we have that they are the word of God : And therefore the authority of every one of these books, is not the same in respect of them all. And this our

Ex

Expositors of the holy Scriptures doe generally acknowledge, and specifie in particular.

Fourthly, It is a tenet of our Chrstian belief, that our revealed doctrine is contained in these Divine Books: And that in the delivery thereof there is no falshood contained in them. This, I say, we ought to hold and believe with all possible certainty.

Fifthly, That it onely belongs to the Catholick Church universally consenting together, to deliver and make known certainly and without danger of error, the true sense and meaning of the holy Scriptures, to all faithful Christians.

Sixthly, All those places of the holy Text which are diversly explicated by our Catholick Doctors without note or censure, cannot, if taken only in themselves, ground an article of our Divine and Catholick faith.

Seventhly, No sense or meaning of the holy Text, can be so infallibly known by any other meanes, *then by universal tradition*, as that an Article of our Divine and Catholick Faith may be built thereupon, without possibility of error.

Eighthly, Although we ought not to condemn of falshood any thing that is related in the holy Scripture, yet such things as doe not belong to Religion, are not properly Articles of our Catholick faith.

Ninthly, No Ecclesiastical writings whatsoever, wherein many things are historically related of several subjects, belonging in some sort

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

to Religion: For example, the lives and miracles of Saints, and the like, whether they be contained in some old & fabulous *Legends*, or in what other book or register soever (still expecting the text of the Bible;) yea, though approved by the greatest authority: These, I say, doe not reach unto the certainty of our *Divine* and Catholick truths.

All the Scripture hath been denied by some Hereticks.

Although our Adversaries doe generally boast of the Scriptures (which they cannot deny but they received them from Catholicks.) And that they also require to have that sense and meaning of the Scripture to be granted unto them, which they imagine to be most likely; yet are they not content with this, unlesse they may also blot out of the Canon what book soever they please, upon any slight reason. So that we have not any one book, no not the least of all, which some proud and *Apostatical Hereticks* have not either quite rejected as spurious and false, or censured as *Apocryphal*. Whereof it seemeth not amiss to cite here some few.

Errors of Hereticks concerning the Scripture.

The *Cerinthæi*, cited above, presently after the Apostles times, about the year 69. rejected the *Acts of the Apostles*, and all the *Gospels* but Saint *Matthew*. The *Carpocratiani*, cited above, about the year 129. said the whole volume of the *Old Testament* was *Apocryphal*. *Marcion*, cited above, with his disciples, *Cerdon* and others, said, the *Old Testament* was composed by an evil God (for they held there was a good God and a bad God) And of the four *Gospels* they received onely Saint *Luke's*: And of S. *Paul's* Epistles only those to *Ti-mothy*

mothy and Titus. The *Archontici*, cited above, about the year 160. did blaspheme the *Old Testament* most impudently. The *Apellite*, *Marcion's* disciples, about the year 178. despised the *Prophets*, as contradicting one another. And about the same time the *Severiani* rejected whatsoever *Marcion* had rejected before them. With whom agreed likewise about the same time the *Euchariste*, in respect of *S. Paul's* Epistles. The *Alogi*, about the year 180. rejected *S. John's Gospel*, and the *Apocalyps*. The *Manicheans*, about the year 270. as also the *Gnostici*, and divers others, did likewise blaspheme the *Old Testament*, as made by an evil God. *Faufus*, with others, refuted by *S. Austin*, about the year 407. held the same error. The *Apocryphi*, admitted onely the *Prophets* and the *Apostles*. The *Albanenses*, *Baiolenses*, *Concordenses*, and others, about the year 796. followed *Marcion's* steps. *Herman Richuich*, about the year 1497. said most arrogantly, that the whole Bible was imperfect, yea and altogether needlesse, and unuseful to salvation. *David Georgius* fell into this same error about the year 1525. The *Lutherans* rejected *S. James* his Epistle, *S. Paul* to the *Hebrews*, the third Epistle of *S. John*, the third Epistle of *S. Peter*, and the *Apocalyps*. The *Libertini* (whereof one *Quintinus* a Shoemaker, and *Coppinus*, were the ringleaders) did deride the Scriptures, and esteem them as fables. The *Abrosiani*, who boasted of their continual suggestions and divine revelations from God, said both the *Old* and *New Testament* were not much to be regarded. The more ancient of these Hereticks

we have already cited and noted when and where they were condemned. Those of later times have been exploded and cast out of the Church, even in these our days.

There can be nothing certainly known by the Scripture, unless we be first certified which they are, and which is their true sense.

Who doth not now see how vain and foolish a thing it is to cry out, *The Scriptures, The Scriptures*, unless we first agree of a Judge, and of such a Judge as may free us from all error; yea, and who may, and can *infallibly* determine and declare unto us which are certainly *Canonical Books*, containing the revealed word of God, and which are not such. Nor will it likewise much contribute to the determining of controversies in Religion, that we be certainly possessed of the holy *Bible* and Word of God, unless we have also such *Expositors* and *Interpreters* of it, as can most certainly deliver and declare unto us the true sense and meaning of it. For the sacred book it selfe is a dead Judge, which can neither heare the reasons of the pleaders on both sides, nor pronounce a sentence. Nay further, clear it is, that the Scripture will be of no force or value at all, in relation to the deciding of controversies in Religion, but must needs fall flat to the ground, if all the *Interpreters* of it, and such as should administer the sacred sense thereof unto the faithful people, may be mistaken and deceived.

The second Paragraph.

*What is of necessity to be believed concerning
General Councils.*

WE have already declared divers things concerning the Authority of General Councils, in relation to their definitions in matters of faith, whereon, as upon most certain principles, all the rest which doth belong to our purpose, is built; which, if I mistake not, he that will solidly consider the businesse, shall easily perceive.

First therefore it is requisite that this Council whereof we speak, and whose definitions we maintain to be *infallible*, ought to be truly a general one, the nature whereof we have already defined. Further, the *Bishops* gathered together in this General Council, are onely *Witnesses*, not *Makers* and *Founders* of Articles of our Divine and Catholick Faith; which, as we have already noted, divers learned Catholick Authors do maintain

Secondly, The matter or subject which is to be declared by a General Council, cannot be any natural or philosophical truth, but must be a matter of our revealed and Catholick Doctrine, or fact of Christs Institution, which must likewise have relation to the whole Church.

3ly, All things transacted in this General Council, ought to be done as a good Council should do them, which our Divines call *Consiliariter*, that

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

is, like wise and honest Counsellors, to wit, that the matter should be well discussed, and a diligent and faithful examen of the point should be premised, and that the conclusion should be without all faction and solicitation of suffrages.

4. Fourthly, That whatsoever is prejacent in the manner of a Preface to the decrees, and laid, as it were, to prepare the way to the *definitive Canons*, hath not the power of *A Definition*. Nor likewise the proofs and reasons which *Bishops* or *Councils* may give for their decrees. Much lesse all that is said to and fro, as it were by the bye, and out of the matter which is in question. So that nothing besides the bare *Canons*, and those to be understood according to the proper signification of the words, is to be held as defined and decreed by such a Council, as an Article of our *Divine and Catholick Faith*.

5. Fifthly, though we have already demonstrated that there is a power in the *Catholick Church*, especially in General Councils, to enact *Lawes*, yet are not all their Decrees and Statutes of the same force. For whatever they may ordain in matters of *fact*, which the whole Church doth not acknowledge to be of *Divine Institution*, cannot have the certainty of our Divine and Catholick Faith. Nevertheless, whatever is universally received by the Church, hath truly the force of a law or *Canon*, whereunto all the subjects of the Church are bound to subscribe and yield obedience. Nor doth it prejudice this truth, that our Divines doe commonly say, that all Councils,

cels, even General ones, may erre in establishing of such Laws as concern Ecclesiastical Discipline, or the Churches Government : Asalso in determining of all other matters, which doe depend of particular informations and Commissioners acts, because such things are to be expended by the rules of prudence, wherein these Bishops are not *infallible*. This, I say, is of no prejudice to what we said before, being such orders or decrees as these, may be committed or changed according to the severall states and conditions of the affairs of the Church, by those who are in authority, and therefore may do it as they shall think fit. However, even these Lawes and constitutions of *General Councils*, as long as they are received, and esteemed to continue in force, ought to be observed and obeyed by every one. For it belongs not to any particular subject (as we have already noted) to call in doubt the Lawes and Statutes of the supream power, nor to correct at his pleasure such customes as are established and approved by authority (which is the proper quality of sedition and tumult) but we are to obey and observe such Canons and customs as are juridically erected and practised.

It is not needful in this matter to alledge the vain imaginations of our Adversaries, nor their no lesse proud and arrogant, then frivolous and impertinent objections, being all *Archereticks* laid this for their first and chief foundation of all their errors, to wit, that it was lawful for them to withstand and oppose the *universal Church*, and *General Councils* (by whom they have ever been con-

It is needlesse to cite the oppositions of hereticks against this point.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

condemned) peremptorily prating and affirming that the whole Catholick Church can universally erre from the truth of faith; yea, and that all Councils, though never so General, and lawfully called and gathered together, may, and often do decree things both in matters of faith and manners, contrary to the Word of God. I remember to have read in *Beza* his preface to the New Testament Greek and Latine, where he saith, that in *Councils or Synods* even of the best times which have been gathered in the whole Christian world, the *devil* ever presided. We will therefore omit to cite these Apostata's wicked blasphemies in this matter.

The third Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of the Pope?

WE have already declared what the Popes authority is in general, and we have laid those principles which will facilitate the way to determine all particulars in this point.

Every true Catholick doth acknowledge, that of all Christian Bishops the *Pope is the first* and sole *visible Head* of the whole Church upon earth. By his mediation there doth accrew to the Church a mutual communication and necessary consent amongst the members thereof. Yet I find it very hard to determine in particular which be the special acts of his jurisdiction; such, I mean, as are annexed to his *Sea by divine right*, so as that it were heretical to deny or dissent from

The Pope
Head of the
Church.

from them, either in words or deeds. For since that we endeavour to mark those points onely which are *essentiall and necessary* in our Catholick Religion, that is, either of *divine faith or institution*, all those rights and priviledges which doe belong to the Sea of *Rome* by any humane concession, either Ecclesiasticall or Civill, are not such tenets as we seek after; being that we all acknowledge, that the same authority that gave them, may take them away. But if the Pope have any particular or peculiar act of jurisdiction of *Divine institution*, which is not common to other Bishops, certainly no authority upon earth ought under pain of excommunication to withstand and resist it. And this is clearly manifest in all things of *Divine institution*, or which are *ordained by Christ Jesus*, yea even in such subjects and matters, as of their own natures belong to the civill Government: for example, The Commonwealths supream Magistrate cannot totally and absolutely forbid his subjects (supposing they make profession of the Catholick faith and Religion) the use of Wine; nor if he should, were his subjects obliged to obey his law, being that Wine is *essentially and necessarily* required by *Divine institution*, for the celebrating of the sacrifice of the Mass.

What ever belongs to the Pope by Divine right is immutable.

Our first conclusion therefore shall be, that all such points as are disputed on both sides, by our Catholick Divines concerning the Popes authority, are to be excluded from the Catalogue of articles of our Catholick faith.

The first conclusion.

Secondly, that in all definitions and ordinances, in which divers Catholick divines do main-

The second conclusion.

maintain, that a General Councel may err, we may likewise hold with them, and with more reason as they think, that the Pope may also err. For example, in a matter of a particular fact, where the decision doth rely upon the rules of prudence, or upon the proofs of information, as in making of laws for discipline, which cannot be alwaies convenient to the whole universality of the Church, or in the *Canonization* of Saints, which must needs take its ground and certainty from the rules and instruments, which the Commissioners may have drawn, who are employed to make the informations of their lives and miracles.

3. The Popes prerogatives are of two kinds.

Thirdly, it is evident, that divers priviledges have been given by the Emperors to the Sea of Rome, which being rightly and lawfully used, are certainly of great good to the Church; whereof, though some be only the markes of human dignity, and wordly greatnesse, which the piety and devotion of divers antient Emperors and Kings have granted unto the Sea Apostolick, yet are they now generally approved by use and custome; Although indeed. the low and humble beginning of our Christian Religion knew no such magnificence

4. There be divers particular acts especially belonging to the Pope which are not of divine right.

Fourthly, Although such acts of jurisdiction and authority, as many of our Divines do commonly esteem to be special and proper to Bishops of Rome, be not annexed to this Sea by any *immediat and expresse institution of Christ*, or as we call it, by *Divine right*, which in some occasions are performed by others, and are some time who-

ly

ly omitted ; yea we see by experience, that these acts are sometimes impugned and withstood ; For example, the *calling* of General Councils, the *appealing* to Rome in great causes, the *dispensing* in matters of great moment, and divers other such like acts of Breves and Bulls as are accustomed, and ought to issue from the Sea of Rome. Although, I say, we see these acts sometimes examined by particular Churches, and by the civill Magistrate two, yea sometimes limited, nay and sometimes quite rejected ; yet doth not this any way derogate from the right due to the Sea Apostolick.

Nor doth it matter that some do object S. Cyprian his resisting S. Steven the Pope, branding him with the title of *error* ; and saying, that he had written *unlearnedly and improvident* ; for the truth is that the same rule was common to them both ; to wit, that *nothing was to be innovated, but what was delivered by tradition* : although their opinions was different in a matter of fact, which was neither of *Divine institution*, nor of *universal tradition*.

S. Cyprian
resisted the
Pope S. Steven.

Nor is it likewise of any prejudice, to this holy and supreme Pontifical Authority, that some Catholick Doctors do acknowledge, that divers Popes have erred ; nay, that being taken in error, they have been subject, especially in times of Schism, to the judgment of the universall Church consenting together.

That the Pope
may erre,

Nor, moreover is it material, that some alleage the definition of the General Council of *Constantine* (which they extoll, as being afterwards received

The Pope is
the head, but
not Lord and
Master of a
generall
Councell.

and approved by the Council of *Bourges*) that *a General Councel is above the Pope*. This, I say, doth not any way hinder, but that the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, is the chief and proper head of all General Councils. Yet dare I not affirm, that the Pope can define any thing Solidly and certainly, contrary to the votes and suffrages of a whole General Council.

Lastly, I see not why we should make any account of what our adversaries do alleage out of some Catholick writers of Ecclesiastical histories, to wit, that there hath been divers Schisms occasioned by Popes; And that some Popes have been deposed, as in the 10. age (*Wherein, saith Bellarmin the Popes did degenerate from the piety of their Predecessors; and wordly Princes did flourish in sanctity*) Gregory the 6. was deposed by the Council of *Sutrium*; which this innocent man (as many think) did willingly undergoe. They object the like against *Benedictus* the 13. who was cast out of his Popedom by the Council of *Constance*. But this is a matter of fact, not of right, and therefore of no consideration at all in relation to the resolution of our Divine faith.

The Pope's
speciall supe-
riority.

It is neverthelesse evident, that there is some kind of special and proper *Superiority* above all other Bishops, given to the Sea of Rome, by *Divine right*, which is acknowledged by the whole Church, and believed with the certainty of *Divine faith*.

That the Bishop of Rome, as *S. Peters* Successor, is the *chiefe* and *head* of all Bishops by *Christs institution*: That unto his Sea have been granted both

both Ecclesiastical and civil concessions, many rights, and priviledges, from time to time, which certainly are most fit and convenient for his dignity. That in vertue of the Hierarchicall order of the Church, it becomes the office and place of supreme Pastor, to dispence in divers things and provide for the common good of the Church which do not, nor is it fit they should belong to every ordinary Bishop or Prelate. That these I say, and many things more of the same nature are due to the supreme Bishop of the Apostolical Sea of Rome, all Catholicks are bound to acknowledge with great reverence and respect. For it is a point of our Catholick faith, that the quality of *head*, and *chief Pastor* of the Church in general, was *ordained by Christ*, and consequently is of immutable, and *Divine right*. However, it is not easie to determine which be the special and perticular acts of his *superiority* settled upon him by *Divine institution*,

It is likewise certain, that the authority and *iurisdiction* of all Bishops, as well as of the Pope, had its origine immediatly from Christ, yea and is *universal*, and *unlimited* of its one nature, as was that of the Apostles, whose Successors they are. Although for the more perfect Structure, and better order of this Ecclesiastical Army, in the spiritual warfare of the Church, it was needful that every one should be divided, and severed with its perticular bonds and limits. Nor was it fit, no nor could it stand with order and unity, that every particular Bishop within his diocesse, should be constituted in such a de-

Every Bishops jurisdiction is immediately from Christ.

gree of authority and superiority, as that in the frame and composition of the whole Church, there should not be a proportionate subordination amongst them all, whereby all the members of this mystical Body of Christ, might be brought to concur, and make one society, in the manner of a *Monarchie*.

All exemptions are against the law of God and nature.

Nevertheless it is most true, that every Bishop in his own Diocese is superior over all the inhabitants of it, and hath both the whole Clergy and the whole Body of the people so truly subject unto him, both by *Divine and natural right*, as that it is not lawful for any authority upon earth, to violate this sacred order. I mean in relation to Ecclesiastical functions and publick Priestly duties. If the Popes sometimes at the intreaty of Kings, or through the neglect, nay perhaps with the consent of Bishops, or upon any other consideration, have granted some exceptions from the jurisdiction of the Ordinaries, whether to Regulars or others, I am confident that no learned and moderate man, who shall consider the business seriously, will easily believe such acts, to be of *infallible right*, being it is to the prejudice of the *Divine and sacred authority* of Bishops and Ordinaries. This, *Francis de sales* Bishop and Prince of *Genoa* of happy memory hath well noted, in the first book of his *Epistles*, and in the 12. *Epistle*, writing to the Bishop of *Belley*, in these words: *Sir, I doe truly congratulate your victories; for notwithstanding what ever is said to the contrary, it is Gods greatest glory that our Episcopal order be acknowledged according to its true value; And that the*

Mosse

Moss of exceptions be torn from the tree of the Church; by which we see so many evils come to it, as the sacred Councel of Trent, hath very well remarked.

Whence it is, that 'tis not lawfull to say, that the Pope or Bishop of Rome is an *Universall Bishop*, so as that he is truly Bishop of every Diocesse, when the Sea is vacant (which some famous Antecessors and Doctors of the Canon law, doe imagine is signified by those words, *Bishop of Bishops, or Ordinary of Ordinaries*;) for this tenet thus understood, were dangerous and erroneous in a matter belonging to faith. Yet doth the care and solicitude of all Churches belong to the Pope, being he ought to provide for them, when those to whom this care doth immediately belong, are defective in their duty; And this according to the due and urgent necessity of every particular businesse, and its circumstances.

The Bishop of Rome is not an universall Bishop.

All hereticks are generally accustomed to set upon this holy and Apostolicall Sea with their venomous and wicked calumnies and reproaches: Insomuch, that some of our late Schismaticks are not ashamed to say, that the Pope is *Antichrist*, whom I conceive it not worth the labour to cite in particular.

Hence it is evident, how falsly all Schismaticks doe accuse us, crying out, that we make the Pope a God; that we give him a tyrannicall power; that we make him Lord of the whole world both in spiritual and temporall; insomuch that he can dispose at his pleasure, of all kind of goods whatsoever, or to whomsoever they belong; That he can free subjects from their obedience due to their

Our adversaries do calumniate at our Catholick doctrine.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

their Princes and civil Magistrates (if they be either hereticks, wicked, or foolish:) That he can depose Kings, yea and give leave, nay procure to have them killed by their subjects: That he can make new Sacraments, or change those that Christ made: And lastly, that he can make new articles of faith. With these, I say, and many such like false, injurious and wicked crimes they dayly brand us, but how undeservedly, I hope, what we have said above, doth most evidently demonstrate.

The fourth Chapter.

*What is of necessity to be believed touching the
Sacraments of our Evangelical and
Christian Law.*

The first Paragraph.

*What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacra-
ments in general?*

THere have risen many Heresies, and some almost in every Age, against the *Sacraments* of the new Law. Insomuch, that we have not any one tenet in the whole Doctrine of the *Sacraments*, whereunto we are obliged to adhere, as to an article of our beliefe, which hath not been gainsaid by some Schismatick or other, and their followers. There

There be three points concerning the *Sacraments* in general which are of *Divine* and *Catholick Faith*: First, that there are certain *Sacraments* of the Evangelical Law, which were *instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ*. Secondly, that these *Sacraments* be in number seven. Thirdly, that by the mediation of these *Sacraments*, God giveth grace to those who come worthily prepared to them, and are made partakers of them. To these may be added the *intention* of him that administreth the *Sacrament*, which is onely that he doe the action seriously, as a man that intendeth to do what is to be done in that case, at least as far as concerneth the external action. As also that which we call a *Character*, which is nothing else but an indelible mark, sigillation, or relation, that such a person had such an action done to him; which therefore doth naturally follow the receiving of three of the seven *Sacraments*, to wit, *Baptism*, *Confirmation*, and *Order*; which *Character* is as it were imprinted in those that receive them.

Three things are to be believed of the Sacraments in general.

Our Adversaries doe falsely accuse us in many things touching these points, and doe unjustly ascribe unto us such a faith as the *Catholick Church* never professed. Against these three *Articles* did inveigh the *Cataphryge*, above mentioned, about the year 181. saying the *Sacraments* were defiled and polluted things. The *Cuthari*, about the year 256. said the *Sacraments* were of no value at all. The *Cathariste*, about the year 279. did abhor all use of *Sacraments*, and said they were abominable. The *Donatiste*, about the

The errors of our adversaries,

the year 358. said, that the *Sacraments* which were ministred by wicked Priests, were null. The *Albanenses*, about the year 791. said the same, imagining that the ill lives of Prelates, did take away the validity of the *Sacraments*. And all these we have already cited how and where they were condemned. *Wickleffus*, about the yeare 1400. condemned by Council of *Constance*, maintained likewise the same error. Which afterwards the *Adiaphoristæ* taught, by whom all external and sensible exercise of Religion was held to be *Adiaphoruni*, that is, indifferent in relation to eternal salvation. The *Armeni*, about the year 140. denied that God did give any grace by meanes of the *Sacraments*. Which error *Luther* did revive, having been buried in oblivion many years. The *Flagellantes*, about the year 1350. (whom *Clement* the sixth condemned) did despise the *Sacraments*. The *Adamitæ* (not those ancient *Adamits* cited by *Tertullian*, by *S. Epiphanius*, by *S. Austin*, and refuted by *Anthenagoras*, by *S. Irenæus*, and by *S. Clement of Alexandria*) but certain later *Adamits*, about the year 1530. amongst whom was very famous one *Rochsesana*, who were condemned by *Paulus Secundus*. These men did both administer and receive the *sacraments* stark naked. The *Bisacramentales*, *Flacciani*, and *Calvin*, would onely acknowledge two *Sacraments*. One *Jacobus Præpositi*, would onely acknowledge three *Sacraments* instituted by Christ, the rest, said he, were invented by the Church: To him the *Trisacramentales* did assent. Whence it is manifest, that there is nothing at
all

all so solid and so certain, either concerning the *Sacraments*, or any other point of Christianity, which can possibly subsist and persevere as a constant tenet, if we let goe the reines of obedience due to the Church, and suffer it to be lawful for every man to opine and assert what he thinks fit.

The second Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacrament of Baptism?

THis *Sacrament* doth suppose the fall of our first Father *Adam*, and consequently *original sin*, whereof we shall speak hereafter. In the interim, we doe believe as an Article of our faith, that this *Sacrament* was instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, to blot out the crime of original sin; to wit, That man, who from a corrupt root took his birth and off-spring, defiled with a foul spot and blemish even in its nature, might be enrolled by this holy lotion of regeneration, into the immaculate warfare of Christ; which is to say, that by this *Sacrament* the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ is given, whereby the guilt of *original sin* is taken away, and all that hath truly and properly the nature of sin, is remitted and abolished.

Secondly, we believe as an Article of our faith, that this *Sacrament* is in some sort, and according to the general and ordinary course of Gods

providence, a necessary meanes to eternal salvation.

3.

Thirdly, that by its first Institution, its *matter* is water; its *form*, are these, or equivalent words; *I Baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* These points, I say, our Divine and Catholick Faith doth teach us.

The errors of
our addersa-
ries.

The Hereticks forsaking *the pillar and ground of truth*, the Catholick Church, have fallen into several errors touching this *Sacrament*. The *Marcitæ*, so called from *Marcus*, *Valentine's* disciple, about the year 155. did frame a strange form of Baptisme, administring it *In the name of the unknown Father of all; in the truth the Mother of all; and in him who descended Jesus.* The *Catapbrygæ*, about the year 181. would not baptize in the name of the *Trinity*. *Paulus Samosatanus*, about the year 270. would not have Baptism administred in the name of the three persons. *Sabbas*, about the year 368. said Baptism had no vertue at all. The *Seleuciani & Henriciani*, about the same time, would not use water in Baptism, because it is said, *Marc. 3. He baptizeth in the holy Ghost and in fire.* *Deulerius the Arrian*, about the year 493. would needs change the form of Baptism, thereby to favour his heresie. *Jacobus Syrus*, about the year 586. said that the forehead of those who were to be baptized, ought to be burned with a hot iron. *Berengarius* refuted by *Petrus Clumacensis*, and condemned by *Eugenius tertius*, about the year 1058. said, that children were not to be baptized, but onely such as were eman.

emancipated. Which *Petrus de Brui*, and *Henricus Apostata* did renew about the year 1125. The *Flagellantes*, about the year 1273. said that Baptism with water was ceased, and was changed into the Baptism of blood to be beaten out of our own bodies with a whip. The *Fratricelli*, about the year 1304. renewed *Berengarius* his error; which likewise many of *Luthers* disciples maintained. As for the *Anabaptists*, they are divided into I know not how many Sects or Classes; the most of them say that Baptism administred to such as want the use of reason, is of no effect at all. *Lucas Sternberger* called Baptism a *Satanical Institution*: And the *Suencesoldians* called it a *sooty bath*. Lastly, *Calvin* said, that the children of those that were baptized, were born pure and holy, and thereby took away *original sin* and *Baptism* both at once. Nor is it a wonder, that such as have forsaken the true rule of faith, the tradition of the Catholick Church, should be thus distracted and divided into such a variety of fictitious and imaginary errors.

The third Paragraph.

*What is of necessity to be believed of the
Sacrament of Confirmation?*

Our Divine and Catholick Faith doth teach, that the *Sacrament of Confirmation* was instituted by our Saviour Jesus Christ; and that by this *Sacrament*, God of his goodnesse doth give his grace to such as come unto it duely prepared, and

The effect of
this Sacra-
ment.

to whom it is rightly administred. – The effect of this grace is to strengthen, and to fortifie human infirmity in the occasions of temptation ; and chiefly to professe the name of Christ in the face of his enemies, if called in question for it ; in which occurrences we have certainly need of special help and assistance from heaven.

The form and
matter of this
Sacrament.

This *Sacrament* hath its *form* and *matter* from Christ his institution, that is, according to their nature considered in common, as the Apostles used them, and as the Church useth them at the present. I say, *according to their nature considered in common*. Which is to be noted both in this and the rest of the Sacraments. For it matters not whether this *Sacrament* be administred in the self-same material *words*, nor more nor lesse, nor whether in the self same kind of *Crisme*, nor in the self-same *manner* of imposition of hands which were used by Christ and his Apostles ; so that we observe the same matter and form of this and the other Sacraments in common, and according to the nature and condition of them as they were prescribed by *Divine Institution*. For example, Some sort of imposition of hands, but which, matters not ; some kind of words signifying the same in effect, and bearing the same sense, but which or in what language matters not ; some kinde of oyle and balsome, but which is not of *essential* necessity ; and so of the rest.

Although the holy Sciripture doth expressely teach us that this Sacrament was practised by the Apostles, and that by it was given the plenitude of grace of the holy Ghost ; yet hath there been
found,

found, and are still, some hereticks who have, and doe despise it. *Novatus* and *Novatianus*, about the year 252. denied that such as were baptized, ought to be confirmed with holy *Crisme*; yea they said, that the *Sacrament of Confirmation* did not require any unction with holy oyles. *Wicleffus*, about the year 1400. did deride the *Sacrament of Confirmation*. *The pore of Lions*, otherwise called the *Waldenses*, about the year 1160. (who were refuted by *Cassiodorus*, and condemned by *Gregory* the ninth) would not allow *Confirmation* to be a *Sacrament*. *Luther*, about the year 1520. said, that *Confirmation* neither was a *Sacrament*, nor did God give his grace by it, but that it was a meer unprofitable ceremony. The *Rutheni* doe absolutely reject this *Sacrament*: And the *Sectaries* of this Age doe generally all of them labour to take away this and divers other *Sacraments*. So that every one abounding in his own sense, having once broken down the limits of obedience and tradition, maintaineth whatsoever pleaseth his fancy.

Rom. 14.

The fourth Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacrament of the Eucharist?

Against the holy *Sacrament of the Eucharist*, and the *Divine Sacrifice of the Masse*, the Hereticks of these times doe belch out innumerable blasphemies. We will therefore exactly and precisely note (observing the true propriety of

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

of words) what is the Divine and Catholick faith of the universal Church in this point.

1. First then, we believe that in the *Sacrament* of the *Eucharist* there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. Which, because it doth subsist of it self, and is animated, there is likewise with it his *soul* and his *Divinity*.

2. Secondly, we believe that *bread* and *wine* are the *matter* of this Sacrament; and the *form* are the *words* of *Consecration*.

3. Thirdly, that the substance of the bread and wine are converted into the substance of the body and blood of Christ.

4. Fourthly, that under either kinde, or *species*, is contained and received Christ Jesus whole and entire; as also the true nature of a Sacrament.

What signifies
transubstanti-
ation conside-
red in gene-
ral.

I thought it not amisse to note here by the way what this word *Transubstantiation* doth signifie, which doth so vex and trouble many of our late adversaries.

First then it is evident, that *Transubstantiation* in general doth signifie nothing else but the action by which one substance is converted into another, or as we may say, a *substantial conversion*: Whereof there be several sorts, whether we speak of them as they may be performed by a supernatural way, as when the substance of water was turned into the substance of wine, at the wedding in *Cana of Galilee*; or as they are performed by a natural way, that is, partly and in relation to the form onely; as when the substance

stance of wood is turned into the substance of fire. Wherefore every action by which there is an *effective transition* from one substance to another; whether it be that the one is produced by the corruption of another, as in natural substantial actions; or that the one ceasing to be, the other is put in its place, as in the miraculous action we mentioned even now; still it is to be said that such an action is in some sort a *substantial conversion*, or a kinde of *transubstantiation*. There be certain actions which doe tend to the production of something that is onely *accidental*, as *augmentation*, by which a greater quantity is produced; *calefaction*, by which heat is produced: but of these we need not speak, as not belonging to our purpose. It is sufficient to have noted, that every conversion of one substance into another, may be in some sort called *transubstantiation*, that is, by reason of the nature and subject of the action considered in general.

Having said that every *substantial conversion* considered in common, may be performed two manner of wayes, either naturally, as when fire is made of wood (for fire sendeth forth his heat into a subject or matter of another nature, so as that by little and little disposing that subject, it doth expel the opposite form, and introduce it self, there remaining still some kinde of matter common to them both. Which manner of production, though it be a hard thing to explicate it clearly, yet because it is familiar and usual to our senses, none refuse to admit it) or supernaturally,

Two sorts of
transubstanti-
ations.

turally, as when in such a substantial conversion performed in an instant, there are no natural causes, by which as by ordinary and proper instruments such a conversion can be effected; that is, by the expulsion of the contrary substantial form (as it happens in natural actions) which we know was done in the miraculous conversion of water into wine, as above mentioned. For certain it is, there were no ordinary and natural causes present, nor any applied, by which, as by ordinary instruments such a conversion could be made. As it would happen, if a drop of water were cast into a gallon of wine, which would be immediately turned into wine.

The manner
of this action
is altogether
unknown.

Hence it doth appear how vainly some of our adversaries doe boast, in that we confesse we are altogether ignorant of the *manner* how this supernatural substantial conversion is made. For who, I pray, can tell how and in what manner the operations of Gods divine power and vertue are performed, when he doth work any thing above the order and highest pitch of natures reach. We may and doe know by *Divine revelation*, delivered unto us by *universal tradition*, the nature and condition of such an action in general and in common, to wit, that it is a *substantial conversion*, or an *effective transition* from one substance to another; but we are altogether ignorant of the manner how this conversion is made: for certainly we neither see nor know how the whole substance of bread, that is, both its form and its matter is destroyed, and into its place is introduced the substance of Christ; which is the proper
nature

Another manner in the Eucharist, which is likewise unknown.

mysterious action, which no mortal man doth know; to wit, *how the Body of Christ is in this Sacrament*, or upon the Altar. Every man knows that a *body or quantity* must needs be somewhere according to nature, that is, in some place by the commensuration of its superficies, to the superficies of another body that doth compass it about. Yea, we know that a Spirit is in a place after its manner, that is, by the actual exercise of its power. But how it should possibly be that a *body or quantitative thing* should be any where *indivisibly or spiritually*, and yet *truly and really*, this doth surpasse all humane understanding. For although relying upon the *testimony* and authority of Almighty God, certainly conveyed unto us by *universal tradition*, we do not stick to believe and professe that Christ his true and real body is upon the Altar, yet it belongs only to his all-knowing understanding, to comprehend the manner how it is there. Which we must likewise necessarily avow of the *Trinity, Incarnation, Resurrection*, and other mysteries of our Christian faith.

Hence it is evident how falsely our Adversaries doe accuse us in many things concerning this point, being the substance of our belief in this Article, doth consist in this, that we professe the true and real body of Christ to be in this Sacrament, not in a *corporal and passible manner*, but a *spiritual and invisible*, which we can neither sufficiently expresse, nor clearly comprehend. For although we may say that the body of Christ is the subject of those visible dimensions, and of that palpable quantity, which before the Consecration

secration were the dimensions and quantity of the bread now no more in *being*; and that Christ, his body is upon the Altar by vertue of them, or by their *meanes* (as every substance is in a place by its quantity) yet doth not this take away the difficulty. For it will still remain an abstruse and an inscrutable mystery, to conceive how Christ his own and proper quantity or body *is here*. And how it can exist in an *indivisible, spiritual, and sacramental manner*, under the formes or *species* of bread and wine. However this tenet thus exprest, doth sufficiently shew, that the objections of our Adversaries are vain and frivolous. Nor is it requisite that we trouble and embroyl our selves in Scholastical and Philosophical disputes and subtilties; whereof an infinite must necessarily arise in the curious search of this inexplicable mystery.

Hereunto are annexed two other Christian truths, which are *essentially* coherent to the former doctrine, and therefore are to be believed with *Divine* and Catholick faith. The first is, that in this holy *Sacrament* of the *Eucharist*, Christ the onely Sonne of God, is to be adored with the cult of *Latria*, that is, with a worship of the highest degree, and proper to *God* onely. And surely supposing the truth of the premised doctrine, it were ridiculous, as well as blasphemous to deny it.

Two other truths annexed to the precedent doctrine.

The second is, that to the integrity of this Sacrament, it is not absolutely necessary, nor appointed by any Divine and indispenfible precept, that it ought to be alwayes and everywhere ad-

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

ministred to the faithful people under both kinds
conjoynly.

The errors of
our adver-
saries.

Against this Divine and Catholick Doctrine, many of our Adversaries have bitterly inveighed, though much divided amongst themselves. There were some very ancient hereticks, called *Sacramentarians*, whom S. Ignatius doth cite, they denied that the *flesh* (not the *Body*) of our Saviour was in the *Eucharist*. S. Ignatius, and S. *Martial* did refute them. The *Catharists*, about the year 279. said, that this Sacrament could not be consecrated in bread made of water and fire. The *Armeni*, about the year 640. (who were condemned by the sixth General Council, and by the Councils of *Brachara* and *Trulla*) said, that this Sacrament can be made onely in leavened or fermented bread, but not in *Azimes* or unleavened bread. The *Albanenses*, about the year 796. said, the Sacrament of the Altar was nothing. *Berangarius*, about the year 1038. denied that the true body of Christ is in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and that the substance of bread did still remain. The *Henriciani*, and *Petrobustiani*, about the year 1128 did likewise deny that the true body of Christ is in the Eucharist. The *pore of Lions*, otherwise called the *Waldenses*, about the year 1160. did invent a new form of Consecration, making this Sacrament by saying seven times over, *Our Father which art in heaven*, &c. The *Albigenses*, about the year 1216. said, the body of Christ was no otherwise in the consecrated host, then it was in other things. The *Begardi* and *Beguinae*, about the year 1314. condemned
by

by the Councel of *Vienne*, would have no reverence made at the Elevation of the body of Christ in the Masse. *John Wicleffe*, about the year 1410. taught, that the substance of the bread and the wine did remain after the Consecration. The *Greeks* did imagine, that the most excellent Sacrament of the Altar, was that which was made upon Thursday in the holy week, the day of its institution, or of the Supper of our Lord. *Carolstadius* (the first Priest that ever publicly married) was the first in our Age that ever said that Christ is not in this Sacrament, but as in a *signe*, or as it is a *figure* of him. Now there be an infinite number of Sectaries in this unfortunate Age, wherein mens licentious wits, and audacious temerity, have framed I know not how many fictitious and imaginary errors in this matter. The *Evangelici*, the *Sacramentarians*, the *Anabaptists*, and others, whereof some say that Christ his body is there under the bread; others, that Christ is truly present if he be received, but not otherwise; others, that God is there conjoynd with the bread; others, that it is only a *signe* of Christ his body; others, that Christ his body is there, but without any blood in it, and that a kinde of b'oodly liquor, not blood, is given to the people; others, that there is no *transfementation*; others, that Christ ought not to be adored in the Sacrament, though he be truly there; others, that it is no Sacrament, but when it is actually used; others, that sinners do not receive it; others, that both kinds conjoyntly are *essentially necessary* to the substance of this

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

Sacrament; others, that neither the one kinde nor the other are necessary; I am sure it was necessary that these and the like heresies should come, to the end that the sole and onely truth of our Divine and Catholick Doctrine should appear more clearly, and thence be confirmed.

What is to be
believed of
the sacrifice of
the Masse.

To the second part of this Paragraph we will say in a word, that it is an Article of our Divine and Catholick faith, that *in Masse is offered a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead.* Which Doctrine doth clearly suppose two things. First, that there is a *Purgatory*, whereof we shall declare hereafter, what is of necessity to be believed. The second, that *Masse is a Sacrifice.* What the nature & condition of a sacrifice is, doth not belong to this place to determine, we will leave it to Divines to dispute. As also, we will refer to the Schoolmens discussions, whether this Sacrifice be an *absolute* one, or onely *relative*; to wit, *commemorative, representative, and significative*, though a true and *propitiatory* one. In the mean while certain it is, that our faith teacheth us, that *Masse is a Sacrifice*, and a most perfect signe of the bloody Sacrifice once onely offered upon the Crosse; *A signe*, I say, together with the thing it self, as the body of Christ is in the Eucharist; and as bread (without comparison) in a Bakers shop window, is both the sign, and the thing signified.

Now the Sa-
crifice of the
Masse is propi-
tiatory.

This Sacrifice is *propitiatory*, but not in that manner as was the Sacrifice of the crosse, to wit, for the redemption of mankind, for the Sacrifice of the crosse was so sufficient, and superabundant, that

that we have no need neither of another, nor of the reiteration of the same, in relation to our redemption. Wherefore Christ doth merit nothing for us in vertue only of the Sacrifice of the Masse, but the fruits of the merits of Christ, bought at the dear rate of his bloody imolation for us, are applyed unto us by it, as they are also by the Sacraments. wherefore, our divine and Catholick faith doth not teach us, that this holy *Sacrifice of the Masse*, as it is distinguished (if we may say that it is absolutely distinguished) from the sacrifice of the Crosse, doth of it self remit sins, increase grace, cause justification; but that by it we do begg the help of Gods grace, contrition of heart, and the spirit of Penance, which blessed gifts, through the mercy of God, are obtained by it.

Our Adversaries of these times, do inveigh with great bitterness against this holy *Sacrifice of the Masse*; for ye find very few before *Luther*, who have dared blaspheme this venerable mystery. It is true that *Alexius*, about the year, 342. said that *Masse* ought not to be celebrated for the dead. and was therefore condemned by the Council of *Toledo*. *Faustus* and *Manicheus*, about the year, 407. came at last to that height of wickednesse, that they disapproved, and impugned the having of *Altars*, *Incense*, *holy vessels*, *lights*, *vestments*, *Statutes*, and even *Sacrifice* it self. *Petrus de Brui*, et *Henricus Apostata*, about the year, 1125 said there was no *Sacrifice* in the Church. *The pore of Lions* otherwise called the *Waldenses*, about the year, 1160. said, that the power to offer
Sacri-

The errors of our adversaries against the sacrifice of the Masse

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

Sacrifice, and to consecrate the holy Eucharist, did as well belong to lay-people, as to Priests. The *Bogomilians*, about the year, 1179 called *Masse*, the *Sacrifice of the Devils*. *Wickliff* about the yeare, 1410. said, there was no sufficient ground in the Gospel, whereupon it could be proved, and assured that Christ did institute the *Masse*; *Luther* (taught by the Devil, as himself confesseth) said that *Masse* could not be offered for the expiation of our sins, nor that it did any good, either to the living or to the dead, but only to the Priest himself who saith *Masse*. *Carlostadius* was the first that banished *Masse* out of the city of *Wittemberge*. *Calvin* blasphemed *Masse* above all others. These have been the Champions of the most part of our late Adversaries. The *Bohemians* imagine (as many now in England do) that all Christians are Priests. But the truth which is powerfull and still the same, hath alwaies prevailed, and will ever prevail.

The fifth Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacrament of Penance.

The Catholick faith doth most certainly teach us, that *Penance* is truly a *Sacrament*, distinct from *Baptism*, instituted by Christ in these words; *Joh. 10.* and *Mat. 16.* *Take the holy Ghost, whose sins ye shall remit, they are remitted; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.* This Sacrament hath for its matter, by Christ his institution, *Confession*

session, Contrition, and Satisfaction; for its form, the words of *Absolution*, what ever they be, so they bear this sense *I absolve thee from thy sins*. This absolution is an act of the Priest as Judge, being Christ his Lieutenant or Vicar; *Its effect* is to reconcile a Sinner with God, so he come truly penitent, and with devotion to this Sacrament.

There be likewise some other Catholick truths, which are in some sort annexed unto this doctrine which we shall specify hereafter in particular, when we come to treat of *Justification*. In the explication of this doctrine, there have risen many questions and disputes amongst Divines, which we will leave to them to discuss, though they will hardly ever be determined by them.

Our adversaries who have left nothing whole and entire in all the points and practises of Christian Religion, which they have not gained and withstood, have opposed this Sacrament in divers manners: *Montanus*, about the year, 181. pretending to have the holy Ghost in him, said, that such as fell into sin, could never afterwards obtain pardon. though never so penitent. *The Novatiani*, so called from *Novatus*, who was condemned in the sixth Council of *Rome*, wherein there were, 252. Bishops, about the year, 252. denied that sins committed after Baptism, could be remitted by any repentance or Penance. *These* (saith *S. Cyprian*) *did take away the consolation and assistance of the Divine piety, and paternall lenity from such as had fallen into sin, though with tears, sighes, and grief of heart, they lay knocking at the Church door: Nor did they admit the wounded*

The errors of our adversaries in this point.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

to have their wounds dressed, but without hope of peace and communion, did cast them out to the rapine of the wolves, and to the prey of the Devil, &c. The *Jacobite*, about the year, 584. said, that it is not necessary to confesse our sins to a Priest, but only to God Almighty. The *Albanenses*, about the year, 796. said, that such sins as were already committed, neither could nor ought to be confessed. The *Waldenses* or *pore of Lions*, about the year, 1170. said that the power to absolve from sins, did belong to lay-people aswell as to Priests. *Wicleffe*, about the year, 1410. said, that exterior confession was unuseful and superfluous. *Luther* said, that *Penance* consisted only in a new life, and therefore rejected the three material parts of *Penance*, which we noted even now. *Melanchthon*, *Luthers Scholler*, but surpassing his Master, did wholly reject this Sacrament. *Spangeberius*, another of *Luthers Disciples*, said, *Penance* consisted only in faith. There be also divers other Sectaries, especially in these times, who do more openly blaspheme this Sacrament, saying, that to confesse and number up our sins, is a Papistical butchery and impiety, that no satisfaction is to be made; and thence lay open the way, and make free passage to all wickednesse.

The sixth Paragraph.

*What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacrament
of Extreme unction?*

The Catholick Church hath learnt, and doth certainly know by Apostolical tradition, descended from hand to hand, that the holy and *last unction* which is administred to the sick, is truly a *Sacrament*, instituted by Jesus Christ, and distinctly promulgated by *S. James* the Apostle. Its *matter* is Oyle; Its *form* is, the *faithful prayer* of Priests, expressed in those words which are ordinarily used by the Church, or some others to the same effect; I say of Priests or Bishops, piously and devoutly offering up those prayers to Almighty God. Its *effect* is the comfort of the sick person, by the recovery of the health either of his body or of his soul, that is, the forgiveness of his sins, supposing he be well disposed, and prepared. All which are expressly noted in *S. James. c. 5.* taken according to the universal interpretation, and general practise of the Church. Nor is it needful to add any to *S. James* his words, for what is more, is but matter of dispute amongst Schoolmen.

Although this Sacrament be directly expressed, and commanded in formal words, in the holy text, and confirmed by the Catholick belief, and universal practise of the whole Church; a custome in use for the space of a continued Series, of 1600. years; yet are there divers who do contemn this

The errors of
our adversaries
in this point.

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

Divine truth & practise. The *Hierarchita*, about the year, 279. said, that the *Sacrament of extrem unction* was not instituted by Christ. The *Greeks*, in the beginning of their schism, and seperation from the Catholick Church, said, this Sacrament doth nothing availe the sick, in relation to their corporal health. The *Albanenses*, about the year, 796. said, this Sacrament was of no value. The *Waldenses*, about the year, 1170. said the same. And so did *Wicleffus* too, about the year 1410. The *Rutheni*, *Lutherans*, *Calvenists*, and other sectaries of this age, do generally all of them deride and dispise this Sacrament. But what may not such rebels say ?

The seventh Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacrament of Order.

Having already shewed that there is a *visible sacrifice* believed and offered in the Church, by Christs institution ; It doth certainly follow, that we ought likewise to acknowledge a *visible Priesthood* annexed unto it, and appointed by the same authority. Wherefore, our Catholick faith doth teach us, that there is a *Priesthood* in the new law, instituted by our Lord and saviour, who gave unto his Apostles and their Successors in vertue of this *Priesthood*, a power to consecrate, offer and administer his sacred body and blood as also to remit and retain sins. That there are also divers *orders* of holy Ministers, of which the

Hierar-

Hierarchie of the Catholick Church is composed, which doth consist of *Bishops, Priests, and inferior ministers*, ordained and established by *Divine institution*. All which our Catholick faith doth professe, which also doth teach us, that this *holy Order*, is a *Sacrament*. This sacred ordination is performed by exterior *words, signes, and actions*, which were instituted, and commanded by our Saviour Jesus Christ at least in common, though not in particular. By this ordination likewise *grace* is conferred to those that receive it, so they come rightly and devoutly prepared thereunto; Being all Catholicks have ever believed, that the holy Ghost is given to the pious and godly receiver of the Sacrament

In the solidity and certainty of this doctrine, is grounded the happy state, and constant perseverance of the whole Christian Church, as we have shewed in the former book. For certainly there's no rational man but knoweth, that the chief welfare and preservation of every society or community whatsoever, doth consists in its government and direction; And this again must needs depend upon the acknowledged authority skill and honesty of the Magistrates and Governors of it. Whosoever therefore doth go about to abolish and take away those Magistrates and Governors, do most clearly machinate the infallible ruine of that common wealth, roote, and branch. Wherefore likewise those who labour to disapprove, or weaken the truth of this *Divine article*, do in effect endeavour to destroy the unity of Catholick Religion, and to overthrow the whole

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

whole building of the Christian belief and common-wealth. Which nevertheless some Apostata's, and rebellious Schismatics of these later times have dared to attempt; having not onely called in doubt, but even despised this holy *Sacrament of Order*, and this *Divine Hierarchy* of the Christian Church, which for many Ages had remained untouched, and not opposed by any, though the pride and ambition of some particular Patriarchs and Bishops have caused divers debates and contentions in the Church.

The errors of
our adversary
in this point.

The *Cataphryges*, about the year 181. would needs have women to be promoted to *holy Orders*. Which about the same time the *Peperzites* did likewise maintain, saying, that women might be made even Priests and Bishops. One *Tandennus*, a *German*, about the year 1124, the first that ever I read or heard of, of this opinion, did most impudently maintain, that all Ministers in sacred Orders, even the degrees of Bishop and Priest, were nothing, nor of any worth, and that all Christians were equally Priests. This Heretick was refuted by *S. Norbert*, and *Peter Lombard*. The same error, dead and forgotten, did *Luther* revive, denying that *Order* is a *Sacrament*; nay said, that it ought to be cast out of the Church; And that there was no difference amongst *Orders*; All Christians, even women, being in the same degree. Yea, we have some Sectaries of this age, especially *Anabaptists*, who say, that all Priests and Bishops are limbs of the Devil. Lastly, *Calvin* made a fantastical and fictitious *Ordination* of his own head, which, said he, consisteth onely in the imposition
of

of hands by the *Presbytery*; which word *Presbytery*, because it signifieth *Elders*, according to its Etymology, he imagined it must be understood of *Elders* in age of yeares; and not such as are so called, because they are promoted, and preferred to governe the *Christian Flock*, in vertue of their sacred Dignity, and holy *Orders*, as the *Catholick Church* doth, and hath alwayes understood it.

The eighth Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of the Sacrament of Marriage?

THE *universal tradition* of the *Catholick Church*, and its approved custome from the *Apostles times*, doe teach us that *Marriage* is one of the *Sacraments* of the new Law: yea, it is a *great Sacrament* (to use the *Apostles words*) Ephes. 5. instituted by *Christ*, as the rest of the *Sacraments* were. Every true *Catholick* doth likewise acknowledge, that it is forbidden by our *Divine and Christian Law*, to have divers wives at the same time. As also, that our *Catholick and Evangelical Law* doth teach us, that the bond of consummated marriage is altogether indispensible by any man or power upon earth. And lastly, that this *Sacrament of marriage*, doth sanctifie the married couple, doth purifie the sensual love which is betwixt them, and give them grace in vertue of the institution and meritis of *Christ*, if they come worthily disposed, and devoutly prepared unto it.

The

The errors of
our adver-
saries in this
point.

The Adversaries of the Catholick Church have prophaned this Sacrament both in words and works. *Marcion*, about the year 155. said, that *mariage* was not lawful. *Montanns*, about the year 181. said, that the contract and bond of *mariage* might be broken and dissolved when ever the married couple would. Which likewise afterwards some of the *Greek Schismaticks* did maintain. The *Tatiani*, about the year 173. (who were likewise called *Montanists*, *Cataphrygia*, *Encratite*, as we have noted above) said, that *mariage* was nothing but whoredom & corruption. The *Adamai*, about the year 194. condemned *mariage* as being naught of its own nature. Which error we hear is even at this present renewed in divers Countries. Nay it is said, that there be certain *Adamists*, who impudently maintain as lawful, and more impudently practise, the common use of all women. The *Manichæi*, about the year 273. said likewise, that *mariage* is unlawfull. The *Armeni*, about the year 640. said, that *mariage* was not a Sacrament. The *Albanenses*, about the year 796. said, that *mariage* was naught. *Durandus de Waldass*, about the year 1117. (who was condemned by the Bishop of *Gerunda*) said, that *mariage* was nothing but a secret whoredome. Our later *Schismaticks* have fallen into many errors, and into an infinite number of several filthiness, both in words and actions, concerning this subject. *Luther*, *Melancthon*, and others, did not only deny *mariage* to be a Sacrament; but said also, that it might be dissolved after the manner of the *Jewes*, according to *Moses* law, upon the occasion
of

of Adultery. Which another Sect called the *E-vangelici*, maintained also, affirming that at least the innocent party, whilst his wife (if a man) or her husband (if a woman) is living, may marry or be married to another. Others there be, who say, that all women ought to be common; so said *David Georgius*, and all his followers. The *Libertini*, who will needs passe for *spiritual people*, said, that marriage must be spiritual, and therefore is best performed by the promiscuous use of women, so that both parties be content. Lastly, all *Sectaries* generally say, that *marriage*, and the rest of the Sacraments, are but all of them humane inventions.

Whence it is manifest, that the faith and belief of the Catholick Church, in this Divine doctrine of the Sacraments, hath always and everywhere been the same: As hath likewise the spirit of pride and arrogance swayed in all *Apostata's* and *Schismaticks*. Which being a lying and haughty spirit, hath sometimes carried them into quite different errors, and sometimes led them into the same follies and misbeliefs, renewing them from time to time, though, for the most part, not without the interstice, or rather interflux of several Ages. Which whosoever shall sadly consider, and will seriously reflect upon these vain novelties of the Churches Adversaries (who no sooner put up their heads, but the whole Catholick Church, in their several Ages respectively, hath ever and everywhere detested and condemned them) would deride them all as unworthy to be remembered, much less confuted.

The fifth Chapter.

What is of necessity to be believed 1. Of original sin ?
2. Of man his justification ? 3. Of merits and
good works ? 4. Of grace and free-will ? And
5. Of satisfaction for sins ?

The first Paragraph.

*What is of necessity to be believed of Ori-
ginal Sin ?*

BY the universal consent of the Catholick Church
it is an acknowledged article of our divine faith,
that *Adam* the first man being placed in Paradise,
did lose that *Sanctity & Innocence* wherein he was
created, by transgressing Gods commandement ;
that is, by that offence and prevarication, fell into
a worse state and condition then he was in before,
and theerby did not onely defile his own person,
but even all his posterity, transfusing sinne into
all mankind, according to that of the Apostle :
*As by one man sin entred into the world, and death
by sin, so death passed upon all men, in whom (for
that) all men have sinned.* Wherefore, this sin is
proper to every one, nor can it be taken away
but by the merits of one Mediator, our Lord Je-
sus Christ. Which merits are ordinarily applied
unto us by the Sacrament of Baptism rightly ad-
ministred, as well to children, as to those of full
age

age. We believe therefore that all mankind, even children as soon as they are born, have drawn and received from their parents, derived from *Adam*, something of original sinne, which ought to be expiated by the water or bath of regeneration, to the end they may be fit for heaven; as we have noted already, treating of the Sacrament of Baptism: This our true Catholick and Christian faith doth teach us.

This *Divine* and Catholick *Doctrine* of the universal Church, concerning *original sin*, hath made many adversaries. The *Cathari*, about the year 356. said, there was no *original sin*, and therefore said likewise, that *Baptism* was not any way necessary. *Pelagius*, about the year 415. refuted by *S. Austin*, and *S. Prosper*, and condemned by the Councel of *Melevum*, and of *Orange*, as also by *Innocentius*, and *Zosimus*, said, there was no original sin in children. The *Armeni* said the same, about the year 640. and therefore denied that children did need Baptism. The *Albanenses*, about the year 796. said, that original sin was nothing. And so said divers others whom we have cited when we treated of Baptism. Whereby we see, that all those who have dared shew themselves enemies of the holy Sacrament of Regeneration, have likewise taken the boldness to deny original sin.

The errors of our adversaries in this point.

The second Paragraph.

*What is of necessity to be believed of mans
justification?*

SUCH is the fair method and beautiful order of Christian Doctrine, as that it doth cohere in a natural and necessary connexion, and bear with it an uniformity in all its parts and Articles.

In the point of man Justification, the Catholick belief of the universal Church, which she hath received from our Lord Jesus Christ, and his Apostles, which she hath hitherto ever professed and taught, and which she will profess and teach to the end of the world, maugre the Devils, and all her adversaries endeavours to the contrary, is this.

After that *men*, through *Adams transgression* became unclean, *so as that by nature it self they became the sons of wrath, and the slaves of sin*, God the Father of mercies sent his only begotten Son into the world, and proposed, as a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, that he might sanctifie both the Jewes and Gentiles, of whom those onely are to receive the benefit of the death of this our Saviour, to whom the merits of his passion are communicated.

Ephes. 2.
Rom. 6.
2 Cor. 1.
John 3.

What is mans
justification.

Wherefore the Church doth profess, that the *first justification* of man doth consist in his translation from that condition in which he is born un-

to

to the state of grace, and of adoption into the quality of the Sons of God, by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The first *ground of Justification*, in relation to those who are of full age, is *faith*, or their belief in God, whereby they doe believe all revealed things to be most true. And the first beginning of this justification in those of full age, taketh its rise from the preveining grace of God by Jesus Christ. Infomuch, that it is impossible that man should doe any thing for the obtaining of his justification, without Gods preveining and inciting grace : Much lesse that he can be any way justified before God by his own proper works, but through the Divine mercy and grace of Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, it is not lawful for a Catholick to say, that our justification doth onely consist in this, that our sins shall not be imputed unto us, but in a true and real justification and *renovation of the interiour man*.

What is the beginning of the justification of the adult.

Wherefore the end, or *final cause* of our justification, is the glory of God, and eternal life.

The causes of justification.

The *efficient cause*, is God himself, who meerly out of his goodnesse washeth us, sanctifieth us, and anointeth us with his holy spirit of promission. The *meritorious cause* is Christ Jesus, who by his holy Passion upon the wood of the Cross, hath merited our justification. The *instrumental cause* are ordinarily the Sacraments, or in extraordinary occasions something equivalent. The *formal cause*, is the very righteousness it self of Christ & God, by which we are made just & righteous (by which, I say, we are in effect, truly and really

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

really just and righteous, and not onely said to be so fictitiously and imaginarily) according to that measure and proportion which the holy Ghost doth impart to every one as he pleaseth, to wit, by grace and charity, which by the same spirit, *is diffused into our hearts.*

Faith onely
doth not ju-
stifie.

Jac. 28.

Justification
may be lost
and recovered
again.

Mat 19.

That there be
some elect,
some repro-
bate.

Perseverance
is a special
gift of God.
Rom. 9.

Wherefore *faith alone*, according to this Catholick Doctrine of the universal Church (although it be the root and first beginning of all justification and eternal salvation) excluding *hope, charity, penance*, and other supernatural virtues, which are the effects of grace, doth not justifie man. Because, *without charity and good works all faith is dead and inanimate*, which being animated with charity, doth work and operate. *If thou wilt* (saith our Saviour) *enter into life, keep the commandements.* Moreover, the Catholick Church doth professe, that justification or righteousness may be lost, and afterwards recovered. The first, through our fault; The second, from the pure mercy of God, *his grace stirring us up to a true contrition of heart*; as we have already said in the Sacrament of Penance.

Further, that amongst men there be some elect and predestinate to eternal salvation, and that purely out of God his mercy; others reprobate out of Gods justice, no Christian ever denied. The just and righteous mans perseverance in justice, is a special gift, and a particular grace of Gods goodnesse. *For neither is it in him that willeth, nor in him that runneth, but in God that bath mercy.* But his mysterious secrets cannot be comprehended by any mortal man : *Who was ever his*

his Counseller? Wherefore no man knoweth certainly and infallibly, whether he be worthy of hatred or of love. For though we suppose some might say with the Apostle, *I am not guilty to my self of anything*, yet must he likewise add, *but in this I am not justified*. It is therefore the belief of all Catholicks, that the just man is justified *gratis*, that is, out of Gods pure grace and mercy through Christ. For our righteousness is none, but we are made just and righteous by the justice of the Almighty and most merciful God, which is in us, after a special and unspeakable manner. We cannot therefore by any means merit the grace of justification, as we shall declare anon. But wherein precisely doth consist the nature of this Divine justice by which we are justified, and which in some sort may be called *ours*, as being in some manner in us; whether, I say it be a quality, or a permanent habit, or only a *transient* and passing act of love and contrition, we will leave it to the dispute of divines.

Rom. 22.
Eccle. 9.

1 Cor. 4.

We are justified *gratis*.

Against this holy doctrine there have been divers Innovators, besides those whom we have cited as enemies to the *grace of Baptism* and *Penance*. *Pelagius*, about the year 405. though a mortal enemy to the grace of Christ, yet, it is written of, him, that he imagined the life of the just ought to be without all sin; Insomuch, that whosoever were once just, he could never sin afterwards. *Bucerus*, taught that men, though never so wicked and prophane, ought only believe certainly that they were in Gods favour, and justified by Christ, and that was enough. *Spangbertus* said the same,

The errors of
our adversary
in this point.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

same, and boldly averred, that the very substance of our justification and righteousness consisted in this *absolute confidence*. *Luther* said, our sins were not taken away but covered, and therefore that all men even the most righteous were hateful to God. *Calvin* said, that the most just did sin in every good action. The *Cacangelici* said, that all our justice and holiness, is merely sin and deserves damnation. *Osiander* said, that Christ his essential justice, not that which he had by grace, but that which he had by nature, is our justice. One *Stancarus*, quite opposite to *Osiander* said, that we are justified by the sole human nature of Christ, even excluding his Divinity. The *Justificatorii*, who were a kind of *Lutherans*, were divided into many Sects and errors about this point. Some would be justified by *faith only*. Others would have it, that God doth impute his justice unto us, though we be not truly just. Others would have Christ his *obedience* to be our justice. Others his *resurrection*. And thus divers men alleaged divers causes of our justification, according to the several manners of speech, which they found in several places of the Scripture, wherein mention is made of our *justice* or *justification*. Such occasion of variety and uncertainty doth the holy text afford to all, those who shaking of the yoke of authority, and rejecting the *infallible* Interpreter of the Scriptures, the Catholick Church, doe embrace only that sense and meaning, which their proud and saucy spirits do imagine to be true.

The third Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of merits and good-works?

The doctrine of the universal Church, which we have declared in the precedent paragraph, is altogether conform and consonant unto this which we shall now propose in this article, as delivered unto us by the Catholick Church.

The whole Catholick society, and Congregation of Christians, doth not only acknowledge Jesus Christ as our Redemer, but also, as a Legisslator, whereby he hath abrogated indeed the *Moyisaical ceremonies*, but, not dissolved the law of *Match. 5.*
nature, which he hath rendred more perfect and complet. Wherefore, Christ would have all those, *Good works necessary to salvation.*
 who were to profess his name, to observe the ten Commandements, or the natural precepts of the Decalogue. *Being, to render to every one in 2 Pet. 2.*
the last judgment according to his works. Goe about therefore (saith the Apostle) to make your vocation 1 Cor. 9.
and election certain by good-works. Abound in every Ibid. 15.
good-work, knowing, that your labour is not in vain in our Lord. For God is not unjust that he will forget your works, and the love which you shewed in his Heb. 6.
name. Further also everlasting life and felicity is mercifully promised to the Sons of God by Jesus Christ, And that to be faithfully given as a reward by Gods promise, to the good works and merits of the just. Yea to be a crown of justice, which after due combate and a consummated course *2 Tim. 4.*

Heb. 4.

1 Cor. 1.
There is no
good work
from man
only.

All good is
from God.

psal. 112.

Theological
questions.

God, even a just judge, hath promised not only to the Apostle, but to all those that love his comming. And this confidence we ought not to loose, which hath so great a reward. Neverthelesse, be it farr from any Christian, that he either confide, or glory in himself, but only in our Lord. For our justice, that is, which is proper to us, and of our selves, is none. For all our works which doe not proceed from the grace of God, given gratis, (that is, freely and without any desert on our part) unto us, are wholly unprofitable, and of none effect, in relation to our chief end, to wit, for the attaining unto eternal Salvation. But such is Gods divine goodnesse towards us, that he is willing, those things which are purely his gifts, shall be the merits of the just. *Jesus Christ is that true vine which doth continually send forth his vertue into his branches; that is, into the souls of the righteous, without which, their works, what ever they be, can neither be grateful to Almighty God, nor meritorious.* All therefore that is good, just, and meritorious, is Gods, through whose mercy, and Jesus Christ his merits, the just may hope an eternal retribution for their good works, done in God, or rather in them by God, *whilest he inclineth their hearts to perform his justifications for retribution,* and who will have their righteousness to be preserved, and increased by their good works.

After this manner, and in this sense, doth the Catholick Church believe that the just do deserve eternal life by their good works, to wit, from the pure mercy of God. Now of what condition and quality is the Justice and meritoriousness of a Christi-

a Christian, that is, whether it is of *condignity* and worth, or of *congruity* and conveniency ; or whether meerly in vertue of God his promise or from the real valew of the work it self, flowing from the *grace of God*, by which it is produced : As also whether the righteous man can any way merit for another ; we will leave it to the schools to dispute.

The pestiferous doctrine of our Adversaries in this point, hath caused an infinite harm to Christian souls. For being they will not allow to the good-works of the righteous and godly, neither the title and esteem of *merit*, of *recompence* or of *reward*, they have opened the gates to the neglect of all vertues, and to the liberty of all vice. *Simon Magus*, and after him *Actius*, and *Ennomius*, about the year, 361. said, that good works were no way necessary, for the obtaining of eternal salvation, but that faith only would suffice. *Sigebertus* alleageth the *Prædestinati*, about the year, 414. saying that neither good-works did any way contribute to eternal salvation, nor bad and wicked works did any way hinder us from it. But I conceive this author did mistake, and that there never were any such, and therefore passe them by. The *Begardi*, and *Beguine*, about the year, 1314. said, that a man once settled in the state of perfection, even ought not to do any good works. The *Flagillantes*, about the year, 1352. said, that all good works were to be despised. *Jo: Hufse*, about the year, 1377. said, that we ought not to trouble ourselves about good works, because, said he, they do neither good nor harm,

The errors of
our adversary

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

in relation to our eternal salvation or damnation, which depends only upon our *predestination or reprobation*. Our later Adversaries do far exceed their ancestors. *Luther* under the colour of the liberty of the Gospel, took away the obligation of the *Decalogue* or ten Commandements; And withall, laboured to decry and abolish the belief both of the *merit*, and *necessity* of all good works. His followers, *Matthie Illericus*, *Spangbertus*, the *Anabaptists*, and others, differed amongst themselves; whereof some of them said, that good works were not only unnecessary to salvation, but that they are *pernicious*. The *Antinomi*, a kind of *Lutherans*, doe reject the law which commandeth good works, and say, that how wicked and prophane soever a Sinner be, so he believe in Christ, he shall be saved. *Melanthon* confessed, that good works deserved a reward, but a corporal or temporal one, not an eternal. One *Bugaurius* commonly called *Montfaulcen*, denied that any good work could be done with intention to obtain, or in hope of eternal reward. The *Majorini*, who were enemies to, and opposers of *Luther*, would not only have good works to be necessary to make the righteous merit, but also, that they were absolutely requisite even before all grace and justification. The *Cacangelici*, said, that all the justice and goodness of the righteous is meerly sin, and deserveth damnation; yea, and that the more wicked and impious any man is, the sooner should he obtain grace of God. *Jacobus Præpositi*, said, that every act of the free-will, how good soever in appearance,

rance, is truly sin in it self. By these and the like imaginary and prophane tenets, the way to all depravednesse of manners, and to all impiety is laid wide open, by these unfortunate innovators; whilest on the contrary the orthodox doctrine of the Catholick Church, doth exhort and induce all to Christians true uprightness and holinesse of life.

The fourth Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of grace and free-will?

Divines labour much how to find a way, whereby to reconcile and conjointly preserve the natural liberty of man with the efficacy of the grace of Jesus Christ. And drawing divers consequences from their various acceptions of words, and from their different conceits of things, they fall into multiplicity of opinions and innumerable disputes, whilest in the interim the whole doctrine of our Religion in this point, I mean, that which is, and ought to be common to all Catholicks, is contained in two articles only.

The first, that man his *free-will* was not altogether extinguished by the fall of Adam, though much attenuated and weakned. In so much that we are taught by our Catholick faith, that, *Man* still remaineth *free*, and doth act *freely*, even in those actions and operations, by which, through the mercy of God, and the grace of Jesus Christ, he

The Catholick doctrine.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

he is to obtain eternal life.

The second, is that the *Grace of God in Jesus Christ diffused into the hearts of men by the holy Ghost*, is absolutely necessary to all men for them to do any good, whereby they may be justified, or obtain eternal salvation. This in brief is the substance of the Catholick doctrine in this point.

That freewill
is an active
power.

Hence it is evident, that the *free-will* of man, whilest it doth assent unto God moving and stirring it up, can at the same time dissent if it will. For *Man* is a vital and active Agent, nor doth his *free-will*, in its operations, carry it self only passively, or after a dead manner, as an inanimate thing doth, but it is in his power to make his one waies evil. Wherefore, we cannot say, that the just man is freed from the obligation of keeping the commandements, nor that the keeping of them, by the help of Gods grace, is impossible to all or any person whatsoever. For by commanding God doth admonish us, that we doe what we can, and that we ask for what we cannot, to the end that he give us help whereby we may be able. Nevertheless, it is not lawful for any Catholick to affirm, that the *free-will of man* is able without a preveining inspiration of the holy Ghost to *believe, hope, love, repent, or work* any thing, as he ought to doe, whereby he may deserve, either the grace of justification, or the reward of eternal life. For it is God, who in all our good actions, *doth work in us both to will, and to perform*. But all *evils*, are ours, whereof, as such, Gods supream goodnesse, cannot be said to be the cause, as he is of our good works. Be it therefore farr from

Philip. 2.

from any Christian to say, that the treason of *Judas* was equally and as properly the work of God as the calling of *S. Paul*. All other things belonging to this matter, as of the nature of *liberty*, of the essence and vertue of *grace*, and the like (whereof the most part are either uncertain or unuseful) are points of schoolemen to dispute.

Divers Innovators have opposed this Divine doctrine of the Cathelick Church; *Simon Magus*, about the year, 55. *Valentinus*, about the year 150. *Marcion*, about the year 155. The *Manichei*, about the year 275. The *Priscilliani*, about the year 388. All those did take away any mans *free-will*, by teaching that *Mans will* doth not act at in any good-work, but only suffereth, and is like a *statua*. *Bardefanes*, about the year 163, said, that mans *free-will* doth depend upon the *Starrer*. *Jovinianus*, about the year 395, denied *free-will*, in saying, that man, after the grace of Baptism, could not sin. *Wicleffe*, about the year 1352. denied *free-will* likewise. *Luther*, *Oecolampadius*, *Melancthon*, and others, said also, that mans *Will* is not *free*, doth not act, but only suffer. And therefore put a stoical constraint, and absolute necessity in every human action. The said *Jacobus Præpositi*, maintaining that *free-will* is not an active cause or faculty, but only receptive. The *Trinitarii* would have *free-will* to be moved by an apperible necessity, as beasts are. *Calvin* took *free-will* quit away, saying; God is the cause of sin; yea, that he did force man to sin. *Pelagius*, and his disciple *Celestius*, quit contrary, gave too much power to *free-will*, saying; that every man

The errors of
our adversaries

man might be righteous and perfect if he would, and that without any internal efficacious grace of Christ; that he could, if he would keep all Gods Commandements, and merit everlasting life in the same manner. And thus our adversaries leaving the middle and Catholick way have fallen into the extremities of falshood on both sides.

The fifth Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of Satisfaction?

WE are now to treat of that *Satisfaction*, which we said before is a material part of the Sacrament of *Penance*, which Sacrament the holy Fathers called the *Second board or plank after Shipwrack*; which doth comprehend a cessation from sinning, by the detestation of sin from a contrite heart, by an humiliation of mind in Sacramental confession (when it may be conveniently made) and by a *painful Satisfaction*, (with any pious exercise of a spiritual life) due for the punishment of sin. That *Penance* therefore is altogether necessary for the recovery of lost grace (as we have said already) the most clear testimonies of the holy Scriptures, and the universal consent of the Catholick Church doth certainly evince. That *Contrition*, or a pious and vehement grief of mind, and a detestation of such sins as we have already committed, with a resolution of a future amendment, doth likewise truly

Penance is necessary for the recovery of grace.

truly belong to the nature and condition of *Pe-
nance*, every Christian will easily acknowledge,
who doth professe to believe the oracles of the
sacred text. Further also no man can doubt
(supposing the doctrine of the Catholick Church
to be true) but that *Confession* is another part of
Penance, and that it is requisite to receive absolu-
tion of sins past, from the mouth of a *Priest*, as
Christ his *Minister*. So that it resteth only to find
out the universal doctrine of the Catholick
Church, concerning *satisfaction*.

That the truth of what we are to believe may Note.
appear more clearly, it is to be noted, that when
we say, that *Satisfaction* is to be made to God for
our sins, it is not to be understood so, as though
in truth and reality, there were any thing to be
restored to God his honor and goodnesse, as being
hurt or prejudiced by our sins. For as there
can be nothing truly taken away from God, so
can there be nothing truly restored to God his
Divine and immutable Majesty. Neverthelesse,
that there is a *Satisfaction* to be made for sins, we
see and know it is a thing, that in all times and
ages hath been recommended by our forefathers,
to all Christian people.

Wherefore, it is a most certain point of our
Christian faith, grounded upon the holy text, The Catholick
truth. and universal tradition, that there is some *punish-
ment due*, and to be paid for sin; which is either
temporal or eternal. Now it is impossible, that
any man should ever satisfie for any offence what
ever it be, whether it deserve an eternal, or only
a temporal punishment. No man therefore,
N n though

though never so righteous, though never so much replenished with grace, can truly and properly be said to *Satisfie* for any offence, though never so small. But supposing the offence to be forgiven through the mercy of God; And if it be a great and mortal one, that the guilt of eternal punishment is taken away, yet doth there remain some temporal punishment to be paid, and some *satisfaction* to be made, either in this world, or in the world to come, according to the constant and perpetual belief of the whole Church, universally consenting herein. And the contrary is manifestly opposite to several places and divers examples both of the old and new Testament; and consequently against our divine and Catholick belief.

It is evident to all Christians, that *Penance* or *Repentance* is requisite to any man that will rise from sin. For he that hath dared to *violate the temple of God, and contristate the holy Ghost*; let him hearken unto the Evangelist, saying: *Remember from whence you fell, doe penance, and doe the first works. Doe penance, and work fruits worthy of Penance; for that sorrow, which is according to God, doth work Penance unto eternal salvation.*

That this laborious pain is to be paid for sin, is manifest by the example of all the Saints of the Church; And these *Satisfactory pains* do not only bridle, and preserve the frailty of man from falling back unto sin, and make the penitent man more watchful and cautious for the future; but they do also cure and heal the remainder of those wounds, which sin had caused in him. For being

1 Cor. 5.
Ephes. 4.

Apocal. 2.

Luke 3.

2 Cor. 7.

The effects of
Penance.

ing that vicious habits are got by living finfully, which doe penetrate even into the substance of mans soul, and are so fetled in it, as that there doth thence arise a great propension, and a more powerful inclination, to fall again into the same sin; It is necessary that those bad habits be taken away, yea, and torn up by the roots, by a painful and long exercise of the opposite vertues. Unto which integrity of a new life we cannot return nor attain unto it, but many tears and labours, Gods Divine justice exacting it so at our hands. Wherefore, in revenge, and for the chastisement of our former sins, it is necessary that we satisfie God the Father through Jesus Christ, by a pious grief of mind, either in suffering patiently such temporal crosses, as it shall please his providence to inflict upon us, or as shall be enjoined us by a *Priest*, or as we ourselves shall willingly undertake, as *fasting*, *prayer*, *Almes-deeds*, or other the like works of charity.

Yet, there is no *Satisfaction* at all made by any man whomsoever (I meen purely a man) though never so just, which is either grateful to Almighty God, or of any value and worth at all, but only by the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ. We suffer indeed, endeavoring to satisfie for our sins, but we suffer not sufficiently. Yet, *If we suffer together with Christ*, as we ought to doe, *we shall be glorified together with him.* It is only Christ, who truly and fully *Satisfied* for our sins, from whom all our *sufficiency* takes what value it hath. For *our satisfaction* such as it is, and in what manner foever it is called *ours*, is rather an application of

All satisfaction is from the merits of Christ.

Rom. 8

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

the merits of Christ to each of us in particular, then properly any true *Satisfaction*. And as by faith (according to the opinion of some of our adversaries) the merits of Christ are applied unto us, so, say we, of all pious and godly works done in our Lord. For of our selves, as of our selves, we can *doe nothing* (*without me you can do nothing*) but in him who doth comfort and strengthen us, we can do all things. And as the Apostle saith; *I live, but now not I, but Christ liveth in me.* So may we say; I work, I merit, I satisfy, but now not I, but Christ doth work, doth merit, doth satisfy in me. Wherefore, *All our glorying is in Christ*, in whom we live, we merit, we satisfy by fruits worthy of Penance, which receive all the vertue in him and from him. *Such satisfactions* as these, by which sinners truly penitent do redeem their sins by Jesus Christ, are neither unprofitable, nor doe any way derogate from the benefit of Christ his death.

John 15.
Phil. 14.

Gal. 2.

Rom.

Luke 3.

As one cannot
merit for an-
other, so like-
wise one can-
not satisfy for
another.

As it is not therefore (as we have already noted) a point of our divine and Catholick doctrine, and of the universal Church, that one man can merit for another; so neither is it that one man can satisfy for another. Yet may perhaps some just and godly man, obtain by his fervent prayers of God Almighty, giving ear unto him out of his infinite mercy, that grace and favour may be done to another, or that anothers sin may be forgiven in such sort, as we shall have occasion to declare hereafter.

As for the *treasure of merits and satisfactions*, which some divines doe say is in the Church,
And

And whereof the distribution, as they conceive, doth belong to the Prelates and Pastors of the Church, but especially to the Pope, It is meerly a matter of dispute amongst Divines, which we shall briefly touch hereafter. As for the questions of *congruity* or *condignity*, of merits and satisfactions; As also, whether these denominations be given unto them in regard of their deserts, or meerly from the mercy of God, we will leave to the schools to be disputed.

Uncertain tenets disputed amongst Divines.

All those Innovators whom we have cited as enemies to *merits and good-works*, and whom we shall alleage in the following chapter as averfed to *Purgatory* and *Indulgences*, have likewise been opposers of these truths. For *Luther*, and other late Apostatas of the same stamp, would admit no manner of *Satisfaction* to be made for sins. Because they thought, that the crime or guilt being taken away and forgiven, there remained no punishment due, or satisfaction to be paid. What prejudice these erroneous opinions have brought to very many Christian souls, which by crying down the utility of pious and godly works, and thence bringing in a neglect of them, and further opening the way, by slighting all mortification and chastisement of the flesh, to a vast looseness of life, I leave it to the judgment of any ordinary understanding man.

The error of our adversaries

The sixth Chapter.

*What is of necessity to be believed 1. Of Purgatory ?
2. of prayer for the Dead ? 3. of Indulgences ?*

The first Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of Purgatory ?

The Catholick
sencer.

THe suppositions of falsities & fained crimes, wherewith our Adversaries are used to calumniate the Catholick Church in this point, are infinite. The Catholick truth, which the universal Church hath learnt of the holy Ghost in the sacred Scriptures, and doth professe as having received it by an *immerrable tradition*, of our forefathers, in a continued Series of 16. Ages, is only this in a word, *There is a Purgatory.* Which signifieth nothing else, but that there is a certain state or condition of souls departed out of this life, which is neither an actual being in eternal felicity nor in eternal damnation ; but in such a state, as that they are in some sort punished, and are there to remain, until they be perfectly cleansed, that so, they may from thence, find free passage into the Kingdome of heaven. These pains whatever they be, as some of the more anient Fathers of the Church did believe, are to be absolutely and compleatly finished and consummated in the last conflagration of the world.

Nor

Nor will this seem strange to any man who shall seriously consider on the one side, the nature of sin, and the manner how it sinks down sweetly and deeply into the souls of passionate and imoderate men, (which we briefly touched in the chapter of *Penance*) And on the other side, with what an immaculate & perfect purity, with what a *splendid nuptial garment*, those souls ought to be endowed, which are to be gratioously admitted into the presence of the *inaccessable sight* of the Divine Majesty, to be contemplated in it felt; such a man, I say, will easily perceive, and acknowledge, that sinful and wicked men, who for many years have lived in all sort of impiety, and even become obdurate at the length, though at the houre of their death they come to be struck with the grace of Repentance, and find favour at their most merciful fathers hands, yet would they have need of some purifying and cleansing, whereby to wash away such reliques of sins, as might remain in their souls, and to scoureaway such dregs and rust of vitious habitudes, as they were not able in so small a time of *Penance* to quit pull up, and root out from the bottom of their hearts.

why there is
a Purgatory.

Matth. 22.

The Council of Trent hath commanded all Bishops to be diligently careful, that the *Sound doctrine of Purgatory*, be every where taught, held, and believed by all the faithful of Christ. And particularly that in *Sermons* to the people, no man meddle with such subtle and doubtful questions as are disputed amongst divines, and which can be of little or no edification. Yea,
and

The solicitude
of the Church
to apparent
abuses.

and that ſuch things as ſeem to be falſe, be not ſpoken of at all. And for ſuch things as tend to curioſity, ſuperſtition, or baſe and ſordid Lucre, that ſuch things be moſt ſeverely forbidden, as ſcandalous and offenſive to the faithful.

Tenets diſputed
amongſt
Divines.

There be many queſtions diſputed amongſt Catholick Divines about this matter, which have no determinate certainty at all, much leſſe have they the Divine and Catholick certainty of our Chriſtian faith. As, in what manner it is that ſouls do ſuffer in Purgatory: whether there be any place, ſpeaking properly, wherein they are detained; whether it be a true fire wherewith they are afflicted; of what nature & ſharpenneſſe are the pains of *Purgatory*. How long theſe pains may laſt in relation to particular ſouls; Whether they may not be all kept there until the end of the world; Excluding theſe and the like tenets from the Catalogue of our articles of faith, how eaſily might our adverſaries agree with us in this point? Eſpecially ſince that ſome of them do teach and profeſſe this very doctrine which we have declared concerning Purgatory.

The errors of
our adverſarys

The *Apoſtolici*, about the year, 199. did not only deny that there is any ſuch place as *Purgatory* but ſaid that no ſouls could be any way purged or purified after their departure out of this life. The *Armeni*, about the year 640. ſaid, the ſame: And there was ſome *Greeks* before them, who ſeemed to be of the ſame opinion. The *Albanenſes*, about the year 796. ſaid, that both *Purgatory* and Hell were nothing. Which afterwards, the *Albigenſes*, about the year 1216. taught alſo. The

Port

Pope of Lions, about the year 1170. denied there was any *Purgatory*, or that soules after this life could any way suffer. The *Rutheni*, and other later *Schismatics* said the same. *Luther* and *Calvin* (excepting such things as we have acknowledged are onely matters of dispute amongst us) do seem sometimes to admit, and sometimes deny *Purgatory*.

The second Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of Prayer for the Dead?

IT doth certainly follow out of the Doctrine of the precedent Paragraph what is of *necessity* to be believed in the point of prayer for the dead. Wherefore our *Catholick* faith, according to the Institution of the Apostles, and tradition of the holy Fathers & sacred Councils, in a continued *Series* of all ages since that time, is this, That souls which are detained in purgatory, are assisted by the prayers of the faithful upon earth, and especially by the *holy Sacrifice of the Altar*.

The Catholick doctrine.

Although this truth be most certain, nevertheless in the Explication of it, there have risen many disputes amongst Divines; which because they are uncertain and undetermined, cannot belong immediately unto our Divine and Christian faith. For example, in what manner the soules of the dead are assisted by the prayers of the living; with what solace and comfort the Divine mercy doth ease these afflicted soules at

Tenets disputed amongst Divines.

the prayer and intercession of the godly upon earth; what kind of prayers they are, whereby these soules are refreshed, that is, whether by those onely which are said in common by the whole Society of Christians, or by every single mans prayers separately: To which soules is applied this help and assistance; that is, whether to all taken together, and in general, or to those onely for whom these prayers of the living are said in particular, and by name; yea, and that which is the chief of all, whether these prayers and devotions be of any worth at all, *in the way of satisfaction*, or as paying for them what they owe, or onely *by the way of impetration*, out of Gods pure mercy. For there be no prayers made by the living, in favour of the soules of the dead, not even the Sacrifice of the Masse, which are of such efficacy and certainty, as that they doe alwayes and infallibly obtain their effect. And the reason is, because these prayers doe not act or produce their effect precisely in that they are said however (which Schoolmen call *ex opere operato*) but they onely have that vertue, or doe attain unto that degree of efficacy, which God *his goodnesse* out of his merciful accepting of them, in consideration of the piety of him that offers, or saith them, doth give unto them.

The errors of
our adversa-
ries.

Our Adversaries oppositions to the Catholick Doctrine of this Article, having been often condemned by the Church, doe the more certainly evince the truth of this tradition. Of this number were all those whom we
cited

cited in the last paragraph. For all those who denied *Purgatory*, said also, that prayers for the dead were unuseful and superstitious. To whom we may adde the *Cathari*, about the year 256. who absolutely denied that any prayer or oblation ought to be made for the dead. *Aerius*, about the year 342. did altogether improve saying Masse for the dead. *Petrus de Brui*, and *Henricus Apostata*, about the year 1125. would allow of no prayers to be said for the dead. The *Waldenses*, about the year 1170. And the *Flagellantes*, about the same time, would admit no *Purgatory*, nor prayer for the dead. And all our Adversaries of these times have generally fallen into this error.

The third Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of Indulgences?

AS the false calumnies wherewith our Adversaries doe labour in this point to brand Catholick faith with the note of infamy, are innumerable: So likewise are there many abuses, which are generally crept into practice among the people, through the negligence of Prelates, and through the interest or ignorance of the inferiour Ministers of the Church, especially of the Regulars.

The Catholick Doctrine in this point in a word is this, That the power of giving *Indulgences*, was left by Christ himself unto his Church.

The Catholick Doctrine.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

Now that the Church hath alwayes used this power given unto it from Christ, And that this right is confirmed by the sacred authority of holy Councils, is evident to all those who have but the least knowledge of the discipline of the ancient Church. Wherefore let no Catholick dare say, that all use of *Indulgences* is wholly unprofitable, and of no good to the faithful people, nor to be used in the Church; nor that there is indeed any power at all in the Catholick Church to grant any kind of *Indulgences*.

The care of
the Church to
take away a-
buses.

The Council of *Trent* doth vehemently desire and exhort, that there be great moderation used in giving of *Indulgences*, *least* (saith it) *that Ecclesiastical Discipline come to be enervated by too much facility*. Yea, and the same Council wishing that all abuses may be amended and corrected, hath ordained that all base and sordid gain and lucre, and all corruption, which may have sprung from superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or any other way, may be quite abolished.

Our Catholick
Doctrine is
explicated.

There be two things in this point of *Indulgences*, which the universal and holy Church doth propose unto all Catholicks, as *necessary* to be believed.

The first is, That the Pastors and Governours of the Church may and ought sometimes to be *indulgent* to the weaknesse of humane infirmity in their *sinful Penitents*. So as that sometimes poor sinners are to be dealt withal, both in the internal or secret tribunal of their consciences in confession, and at the external tribunal before their Ecclesiastical Judges, not according to the rigour

rigour of justice (lest the extremity of right become the extremity of wrong) but with meeknesse in lenity, forgiving chiefly and having mercy on them; nay and sometimes permitting what in it self is lesse perfect. For being the paine or punishment, which the Priest is to impose upon this penitent, ought, according to the nature of the thing, correspond to the measure and quality of his crimes; yet it is needfull sometimes to deal with him out of prudence and charity with much *Indulgence*. And this, as the Apostle saith, *is to deale not according to commandment, but according to Indulgence.*

1 Cor. 7.
Mat. 24.

The second is (which happens very often in this age, *wherein Christian charity is grown quite cold*) that we are to be *Indulgent* to our Penitents, chiefly by dispensing in the severity of the ancient Canons of the Church, and not to exact, in either of the *Tribunals*, the observance of the publick and rigid constitutions of the primitive times; and this either according to the degree of the vehement grief of mind, and contrition of heart, which the Penitent may have; or according to the disposition of his corporal weaknesse, as the *Penitentiary Priests*, who are Judges hereof, shall think it requisite and necessary for their *Penitents*.

All other questions in this matter are doubtful, and disputed to and fro by our Divines. As whether there be any treasure of merits and satisfactions in the Church (which we have already noted) whereof the Pope and other Bishops are the Dispensers; whether the punishments which

Doubtful tenets concerning the paines which are to be paid in this world for sins.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

Uncertain positions concerning the paines which are to be paid in Purgatory.

naturally and before God ought to be paid for sinne, be it publick or secrete, can be accomplished by any other, then by the sinner himself; I say, can be accomplished by *way of payment and satisfaction due*. For how one mans sinne may be alleviated and remitted, through Gods mercy, at the humble petition of another, by *way of supplication and prayer*, we have already declared. These questions, I say, are uncertain concerning the punishment due unto sin, which ought to be paid in this life. As concerning the punishment which is to be paid in Purgatory, these same questions are disputed with far more uncertainty, inso-much that it is not certain, by our Divine and Catholick faith and tradition, whether by any *Indulgences* whatsoever, these paines which before God, and from the nature of the thing it self, ought to be paid in *Purgatory*, can be eased or remitted. For we hold it altogether uncertaine, whether any other paines can be remitted by *Indulgences*, then those which are enjoined by the Church, and not any punishment at all which is due for sinne of its own nature. Nay further, it is very uncertain of what effect any *Indulgences* are, which are onely applyed to the *soules in Purgatory*. Much more it is uncertain, whether any soules can be *delivered out of Purgatory* by vertue of any *Indulgences* whatsoever, and whether they be of any effect at all for the dead. So that it is not certain, whether all the prayers, oblations, Masses, celebrated even upon privileged Altars (as they call them) and all other such like pious works, be of any value and effect for the dead

pre-

precisely, in vertue of those *Indulgences* which are applyed to the dead, but onely by the way of prayer and supplication : That is, according to the proportion of the sanctity and godlinesse of those that pray or offer Sacrifice, and according to the sacred disposition of Gods providence and pleasure , whereof we are wholly ignorant.

According to this true and Catholick doctrine of *Indulgences*, we shall finde fewer Adversaries, I mean, enemies of these certain and Catholick truths, then Divines doe generally imagine. Yet hath there been some who have denied that there is any power at all in the Church of giving *Indulgences*. And particularly many of those whom we have alledged already denying *Purgatory* ; And of those who disapproved prayer for the dead. The *Waldenses*, about the year 1160. very specially denied that *Indulgences* could be of any worth in any manner whatsoever. *Wicleffus*, about the year 1350. said, it was a folly to imagine that *Indulgences* were of any worth at all. *Luther*, *Jo. Westphalus*, *Jac. Prappositi*, with many other of our late *Schismaticks*, did mainly oppose all sorts of *Indulgences*, and called them a *pious deceit* of the faithful. And from the small sparks of disputes in this matter mis-understood, first kindled in *Germany* betwixt the *Austin* and *Dominican* Friars, mutual envy by little and little blowing the coales of contention, there began an hundred yeares agoe this unfortunate Schism, which giving way to a libertine and voluptuous life, hath found easie passage everywhere, and hath

hath now, alas ! infected a great part of our Christian Europe, as we plainly see.

The fourth Chapter.

What is of necessity to be believed, 1. Of the Invocation of Saints ? 2. What of Reliques ? 3. What of Images ?

The first Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of the Invocation of Saints ?

WHosoever would propose unto himself as a rule of his faith, the perpetual tradition of the Catholick & Apostolick Church, received from the very birth of Christian religion, ratified by the universal consent of the holy Fathers in all Ages, and confirmed by the decrees of the sacred Councils from time to time, would surely never swerve from the belief of the present universal Church, neither in this point of *Invocation of Saints*, nor in any other whatsoever.

This Catholick doctrine.

It is therefore a most certain truth of our Catholick faith, that the Saints who are in heaven with Christ, doe pray for men upon earth, and that it is lawful and profitable for us to pray to them. For although our Lord Jesus Christ be our onely Redeemer and Saviour, yet hath it ever been the constant doctrine and belief of the whole

whole Church, that it is lawful to have recourse to the help & prayers of the Saints, for the obtaining of graces and blessings of Almighty God, through his Son Jesus Christ, in order to our eternal salvation. Wherefore he is to be censured to have an *erroneous sentiment*, who shall deny that Saints, who actually enjoy an eternal felicity, may not be invoked; or that they do not pray for men living in this world. Much worse were it to say, that the *invocation* of them is *Idolatry*, against the word of God, and prejudicial to the honour of our onely *Mediator* and *Redeemer*, betwixt God and Man Jesus Christ.

Our Adversaries do most uncharitably calumniate us, when they preach and cry out, that Catholick Priests do offer the Sacrifice of the Masse, to Saints. For although Priests be sometimes used to celebrate Masse in the memory and honour of Saints, yet is not this Sacrifice ever offered to them, but to God onely. Further also, we are falsely accused by our Adversaries, saying, that we believe and teach, that Saints ought to be invoked under pain of eternal damnation. For though it be true, that we profess Saints may be lawfully and profitably invoked; yet do we not say that it is an Article of our Divine and Catholick faith, that every one is obliged to the actual practice of this Invocation; for a Catholick may be saved, nay perhaps some are saved in effect, who never actually invoked any Saint in Heaven, during their whole life in this world.

The calumnies
of our adver-
saries.

Let Divines dispute whether the worship which

Theological
questions
doubtfully

P p

we disputed.

we give to Saints, be properly a *Religious* worship. Whether the worship which we call *Dulia* (for the worship which we call *Latria*, is only given to God) be an act of Religion, speaking properly. Whether the acts of respect by which we honour the Saints in heaven, and by which we honour worldly great men and civil Magistrates, be of the same nature. Whether in both these acts of worship, it be a created worth and dignity that we honour. And whether, and how this general notion of a created worth is common to the worth both of the Saints, and of great men and Magistrates. Let these, I say, and the like questions be disputed amongst Divines; they belong not to our Theme.

Note the ignorance of our adversaries.

When our Adversaries deride us as fooles for praying to Saints in heaven, either in words or thoughts, because, say they, Saints have no ears whereby they can hear mens prayers; They do but discover herein their stupidity and ignorance. Doe they think God himself is corporeal? or that a Spirit cannot hear though it hath no eares nor bodily extension? These men sure understand little of the nature of a Spirit. For Saints to hear, is nothing else then for them to know and understand; as it is in God himselfe, though in a far superiour degree then in other Spirits. Nor is it hard for a learned man to demonstrate out of the principles of nature, that every Spirit doth perfectly know and comprehend the nature, motions, and actions of all corporeal things whatsoever. Wherefore it is a truth worthy of our Christian Religion, to believe

lieve that fuch Spirits as are bleſſed with an eternal felicity, after ſo many victories and triumphs over the devil, the fleſh, and the world, may be juſtly honoured and invocated. Whence S. Hierom ſaid rightly ; *If it was piously ſaid to S. Paul yet living upon earth, pray to God for me, why ſhould he be eſteemed impious, who in the ſame words ſhould invoke him now reigning in heaven ?*

Although this truth be moſt certain and evident, yet it is not believed nor taught, as a revealed article of our Chriſtian doctrine, to wit, that Saints doe hear and underſtand our prayers. It doth clearly follow out of divers places of the holy Scriptures, *As, that there is joy in heaven at the repentance of a ſinner.* And therefore it is manifeſt, that the Angels in heaven doe know the conversion of ſinners, whereat they rejoyce. But for the manner how the Saints and bleſſed Spirits in heaven doe know all earthly things, that is a queſtion for Divines, or rather for Philoſophers to diſcuſs.

LUC. 15.

Now of what weight and moment are generally amongſt men the examples of others propoſed before their eyes ; And how much more efficaciously are moved and allured the nobler ſort of men and generous ſpirits, by the firſt pattern of an high and excellent enterpriſe and atchievment perfectly accompliſhed, no man of worth and prudence can be ignorant. If there be any abuſes amongſt the credulous people, either in the manner of invocation of Saints, or in the method and faſhion of worſhipping and honouring them, the ſolicitous Paſtors of the Church, doe wiſh

Examples
work much
upon men.

they might be universally corrected. In the interim let no wise man say, that the pious use of these means to godliness, ought to be taken quite away, because through the Prelates carelesnesse, there creeps now and then into the practise thereof some small abuses.

The errors of
our adversa-
ries.

This Doctrine hath been opposed by some ancient, and by many moderne Schismaticks. *Eustathius* Bishop of *Sebastia* in *Armenia*, about the year 320. would neither have the Saints in heaven to be invocated, nor to be worshipped. *Vigilantius*, about the year 420. condemned by the Church, because he taught, that whilst we live, we may pray for one another, but that after death none prayeth for another. *Petrus de Bruijs*, and *Henricus the Apostata*, about the year 1125. would not have Saints to be invocated. The *Waldenses*, or *Pore of Lions*, about the year 1160. said, the Saints in heaven did not give ear, or attend unto the prayers of the living. The *Publicani*, about the year 1274. said, that we ought not to seek for any help by the prayers of the Saints. The *Bohemi*, about the year 1370. did likewise oppose both the invocation and worship of Saints. *Luther*, *Oecolampadius*, *Beza*, and many other late Schismaticks, have also fallen into this error.

The second Paragraph.

*What is of necessity to be believ^d concerning
the Reliques of Saints?*

TO this generally received and approved practice of invocation of Saints, doth clearly follow the unanimous doctrine of the universal Church, for the lawfulness of the honouring and worshipping of their Reliques. That is to say, That the sacred bodies of holy Martyrs, and other blessed Saints reigning with Christ in heaven, who during their abode upon earth, were the living members of Christ, and the Temple of the holy Ghost, and which are to be raised again to eternal life, and to be glorified; that these bodies, I say, may be rightly honoured by the faithful people. Whosoever therefore shall refuse to give veneration to the Reliques of Saints, and to honour them, and other such like holy monuments, yea and shall say that it is unlawful and unprofitable to make any commemoration of the Saints, as begging their help and assistance; such a man is to be esteemed by all Catholicks, as one condemned by the universal Church.

This Catho-
lick doctrine.

There be two things concerning the reliques of Saints, which ought to be carefully looked unto by the Pastors of the Church. The first is, that such reliques as are exposed to the people, to be honored, be true ones, and be indeed such as they seem, and are said to be, I mean, with as much

Two things to
be cared for
concerning
the Reliques
of Saints.

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

much certainty thereof, as humane prudence is able to foresee and provide. The second is, that all Superstition, and all other abuses whatsoever, be prevented and taken away in the exposing, in the worshipping, and in the visiting of these reliques. To this end the Council of Trent hath ordained several things, which are remitted to the care of Bishops, unto whom it is enjoined, that they neither easily admit any new miracles, nor receive any new reliques. Insomuch, that nothing in this matter is to be innovated, or permitted, but what the Bishops of every Diocese respectively doe judge, and clearly find to be true and godly.

Now me thinks I should hardly conceive, that any Christian, who hath any spark of zeal to his Religion, believing certainly and constantly, that *S. Peter* and *S. Pauls* uncorrupted Bodies were laid before him, and considering them seriously, as the members and instruments of those blessed men, who living did preach and teach the Gospel of Christ; and dying, watred it with their blood; I can hardly believe, I say, but that such a man would give them some respect and veneration; not that we ought to think, there is any divinity or vertue in such material and dead flesh and boans, but that such bodies and reliques, have so neer a relation to their blessed spirits, as that who should contemn the Bodies, would likewise be thought to despise the souls.

The honour
given to Saints
is a religious
honour.

Of what nature and condition this veneration is considered in general, is not hard, me thinks, to discover, by whomsoever will look seriously
into

into the busi nesse. For since that the act of honor is in him that honoreth, and that we give honor to every thing in as much as it doth belong and hath a relation to something that is dear unto us; And further that we give to every thing that degree of honor and respect, which we conceive is due unto it, according to the measure of its neernesse to our intrest; It doth evidently follow, that the nature and condition of every act of honor, doth take its form and being from the motive of him that honoreth, and from the quality of the thing that is honored. Now Saints bodies or reliques, have some kind of relation unto Religion, the honor therefore which is due, and may be given unto them, must needs be a pious and Religious honor. All civil and political Magistrates, and all wordly great men, yea, and all things that doe belong unto them, in the same kind, are to be honored with a political and civil worship; But all things which doe any way belong to Religion, and which are honored for Religion sake (even a man whom we think doth live a more godly and Saintly life upon earth then ordinary) must needs be worshiped with a Religious honor. Wherefore excluding all occasions and dangers of abuses, I wonder there should be any moderate Christian, that should so bitterly envy and rail against that pious honor, which we give unto the bodies and reliques of Saints, for their souls sake.

All those whom we have already cited as enemies to the invocation of Saints, have likewise been no lesse averse to their bodies and reliques.

The errors of
our adver-
saries.

As

As also *Porphyrus* the Apostata, that subtle philosopher, and *Origens* schoolefellow. *Eustathius* Bishop of *Sebastia*, about the year 320. *Eunomius* the *Arrian*, that acute Logitian, about the year 335. and some other enemies of all holy things, at the same time, would neither have the Saints, nor their bodies, nor their reliques, to be any way honored. *Vigilantius*, about the year 407. said, that the Sepulchers of Martyrs were not to be revered. The *Iconoclasta*, condemned by the second Council of *Nice* (of whom we shal speak in the following paragraph) did prophane the Temples, the Sepulchers, and the reliques of Saints; from which, the cures of diseases did proceed, saith *Photius*. *Constantinus Copronicus*, about the year 743. amongst many other of his abominable wickednesses, did dispise the bodies and reliques of Saints, and condemned them to be burnt. *Claudius* the Bishop of *Taurinum*, refuted by *Ionas* of Orleans, and condemned by the Synod of *Cabillonum*, with *Wicleffe* his contemporanean and countryman, would needs abolish all Crosses and reliques, ; and said, that the Sepulchers of Saints, ought not to be revered. Our latter adversaries have generally raged against the Saints in heaven, and against their ashes upon earth, whereof we shall speak more fully in the following paragraph.

The third Paragraph.

What is of necessity to be believed of holy Images?

IN the former Book of this Treatise, we distinguished betwixt such truths as we call properly *Catholick*, because they are revealed by God, and deduced by perpetual tradition, and other truths which we know are onely groundd upon the common use of the Church, and the universal discipline of all Christians. Now, because we certainly believe, that none of these second sort of truths doe rely upon a false ground, we doubt not but that the good and lawful use of Images, is of great profit to the faithfull people.

Wherefore, the Catholick Doctrine of the universal Church in this point is, 1. That the Images of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the B. Virgin Mother of God, and of all other Saints, may be lawfully had and kept, especially in Churches. 2. That some honour and veneration may in some sort be given to these Images. Now it is a wonder to see how our Adversaries have dared blaspheme the Church of God in this point; and with how many fictitious crimes they have scurrilously calumniated the Spouse of Christ in this holy Doctrine. The Catholicks, say they, doe adore even Gods of stone and wood. How stupid and senselesse doe they imagine the whole Catholick world to be? As though it were credible, so many thousand of most learn-

The calumnys
of our adversaries.

Our Catholick
Doctrine ex-
pllicated.

ed, and most religious men, dispersed all the world over, should be so grossely ignorant, and erre so impertinently and perversely. The Catholick Church did never believe, nay she hath always condemned those that have believed that there is a Divinity, or any other vertue in *Images*, for which they may be revered and worshipped. Muchlesse, that *Images* may be prayed unto, or any trust be put in them, after the manner of the *Gentiles*, who put their hopes in *Idols*.

We do therefore professe, that all the worship and honour which we give to *Images*, is wholly referred to the *Prototypes*, that is, to them who are represented by those *Images*. So that in effect, and properly speaking, we do not adore the *Image*, but Christ by the *Image*, as also those Saints whereof those *Images* doe bear the similitude, or do represent. As for the *Images* of the *Trinity*, and of *God*, considered onely according to his Divinity, it is a different question from that of the *Images* of our Lord Jesus Christ in his humanity, and of the representations of Saints, for there be some Catholick Divines, who doubt of the lawfulness of the use of the first sort of *Images*. Nor doth the Council of *Trent* make any mention of them, but is wholly silent, when it explicateth our Catholick faith in this point. Nor doe we commonly use these words, *adoration* or *adore*, when there is occasion of delivering our Catholick Doctrine concerning the worship and veneration which is to be given in some sort to *Images*. And further, although we have shew-
ed,

The Images of
the B. Trinity,
and of God,
are not appro-
ved by any
positive au-
thority.

ed in the last Paragraph, that the worship which is given to Saints, to Reliques and to Images, is according to the principles of reason, a *Religious worship*; yet what kinde of worship this is, yea whether it may be properly and absolutely called a *Religious worship* or no, is no Article of our divine faith, but a subject of Schoolmens dispute and discussion.

These truths supposed, the fruit which may be received from the lawful use of holy Images, is certainly very great; for the histories of the mysteries of our Redemption, drawn in pictures, and expressed in lively similitudes (as of the Birth, Miracles, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Saviour Christ; (as also of the sufferings and cruel deaths of the Apostles and other Martyrs) doe strongly imprint, and mainly confirm in the peoples fancies and soules, the memory of the articles of our Christian faith, and of the benefits procured unto us by our Saviour Christ: As doe likewise the Images of Saints, laid before the eyes of the faithful, incite them to frame their lives and manners in imitation thereof.

The fruit of Images.

Although these practises, well observed, be truly profitable, yet will every prudent and experienced Catholick easily grant, that the unlearned doe hence take occasion, now and then, to fall into some slight and small errors, and that in this practice there doe sometimes abuses happen, which we desire might be taken away. But this belongs to them to perform, to whom God hath given the charge of soules. These spiritu-

There may be some errors in Images.

tual Magistrates, I mean Bishops, who are earnestly admonished by the Council of *Trent*, to be diligently watchful, that no vain superstition, no base lucre, no undecency, immodesty, or any other inordinate and preposterous accommodation be suffered about pictures or Images. That no unseemly thing may appear *in the house of God, which nothing but holiness doth become.* And further, this Council hath ordained divers things to this effect, which if they were observed, would take away all occasions of abuses.

Psal. 92.

The errors of
our adversaries

Against this Catholick Doctrine, and practice of the universal Church, we have divers Adversaries, who rail most furiously. *Vigilantius*, about the year 420. who as he would not allow that Saints should be honoured, muchlesse would he approve the veneration of their Images. *Mahomet*, about the year 630. to make the Jewes his friends, extermined all Christian Images. The *Iconoclaste*, or *Iconomachi*, about the year 715. whose Head and chief Abettor was *Leo 10.* the Emperour, and his Sonne *Constantinus Copronicus* followed his Fathers steps, commanded all Statua's and Images to be taken out of the church and burnt. These men therefore were condemned in the second general Council of *Nice*, consisting of 350 Bishops. *Petrus de Bruiis*, and *Henricus the Apostata*, about the year 1120. would have all Crosses to be trod under foot. The *Waldenses*, about the year 1160. said, that it is Idolatry to have any Images in Churches. *Claudius Bishop of Taurinum*, about the year 1350. was the Captain of those who in his time said, that our Savi-

our

our his Crosse ought not to be worshipped by any meanes. All our later Adversaries, as *Luther, Carolstadius, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, Brentius, Calvinus*, and their followers, would have all Crosses to be broken, and all Images burnt. This being an unseparable propriety of heresie to destroy, subvert, and throw down whatever they dislike, though never so well grounded upon Apostolical and perpetual tradition, or commanded and ordained by the supreme tribunal of the Catholick Church.

The eighth Chapter.

Of certain Articles or Christian truths, which are of an inferiour order, and which doe belong to our Christian faith, in as much as they doe clearly follow either out of the principles which we have laid, and settled above, or are received by all Catholicks; that is, by the common and universal consent of the Catholick Church.

THe points or Articles which we are to treat of in this Chapter, are of two kinds, as appears by the division in the title of the Chapter. For some truths there be, which are connexed by immediate consequences to those principles, which we established in the precedent Book, or to these particlular tenets of our Divine and Catholick faith, which we have declared and specified in this second Book. Others there be which

Those truths
are of two
kinds.

doe only rely upon this foundation, that they are either deduced by perpetual tradition with the universal consent of the Church, or settled by Ecclesiastical Constitutions.

Pastorall mission.

A main truth of the first sort is, that the *Pastors* of the Church ought to have a lawful *Mission*; for being that in every discipline, or in the delivery of every doctrine there must necessarily be those that teach, and those that are taught, three things are requisite therein. The *Doctrine* which is delivered, the *people* or subjects who are to be instructed, & the *Masters* or *Doctors* who are to teach and instruct. That such Masters or Teachers of our Christian Doctrine, was of necessity to be instituted and appointed throughout the universal Church, is most evident, I mean, to the end that this charge and office (which is the chief and principal point to be considered and settled in the institution of every society) might be regularly and constantly performed, as we have already demonstrated. For these Officers or Magistrates, *how should they teach or preach unlesse they be sent?* Nor certainly ought any man to take this honor to himself, but onely he that is called by God as Aaron, &c. For he that doth not enter by the door into the sheepsfold, but climbeth some other way, he is a thief and a robber; but he that entreth in by the door, is the shepherd of the sheep. Now that there ought to be in the Church *Pastors* and *sheep*, yea that good *Pastors* ought to give their lives for their sheep, the Gospel doth expressly teach us. And the Apostle saith: He gave some *Pastors* and *Doctors* to the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, and

Rom. 10.

Heb. 5.

John 10.

Ephes. 4.

and for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all meet in the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Sonne of God, &c. Watch therefore over your selves, and over your whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath put you Bishops to govern the Church of Acts 20.
God. Wherefore, the universal consent of all Christians doth sufficiently testifie, that this authority given from heaven, and perpetuated since Christ, in a continual succession, is altogether necessary for the undertaking and performance of the office of Pastor and Doctor in the Church.

If on the contrary we should grant, that it is lawful for any man to take this honour upon him, and to intrude himself into this office & function, because he conceives himself worthy of it, and fit for it; or because he shall presume he will teach nothing but sound doctrine; or because that he is in some sort chosen by the people, and that he hath at least some kind or piece of Ordination; or lastly (which is the top of folly) because he doth challenge an extraordinary vocation and Mission, immediately revealed unto him from God; If, I say, we suppose it to be lawful for every man, though even the most rude and senseless of the people, to intrude himself, under the pretext and colour of any of these reasons, into the publick functions of *Pastors* and *Doctors*, it must certainly follow, that there will remain no difference betwixt the *Pastor* and his *flock*, betwixt the *Judge* and the *people*, betwixt the *Superiour* and the *subject*; nor consequently will there be any discipline or order in the Christian society, but a troubled
pertur-

perturbation and confusion of all things, and at length a total destruction of all Religion.

As for *private inspirations* (wherewith some ignorant and pitifully deceived people do imagine they are endued, and thence fancy to themselves, that this function is imposed upon them from God) the true marks of them, and whereby indeed they ought to be testified, are no other then *miracles themselves*. Nor can divine inspirations be known by any other means, then by the fruits and effects. For it were foolish and ridiculous to think to discern the doctrine by the spirit; whereas on the contrary side, the spirit is to be discerned by the doctrine.

Traditions are
to be observed

Another truth of the same kind is, that there are divers both *Divine* and *Apostolical traditions*, which ought to be observed, whereof some do belong to the internal act of our mind, others to the external cult and worship of Religion; which though not expretly contained in the Scripture, yet are they, I say, to be observed; All such I mean, as are truly *Catholick* and universal, approved and practised by a continual succession now of 16. ages, and received with the unanimous consent of the whole Church. *Hold fast* (saith the Apostle) *the traditions which you have learned, whether by word of mouth, or by our Epistle*. Whereupon the Council of *Trent* doth profess, that for traditions, as well belonging to faith as manners, whether taught by our Saviour Christ himself, or dictated by the holy Ghost unto his Apostles, and universal'y observed in the *Catholick Church*, in a continual succession; The Council,

Thef. 2.

Council, I say, doth professe that such traditions as these are to be *received and respected with as much piety, devotion, and reverence, as the Scriptures themselves.* Of these traditions there be divers which are daily used, both in the practise and dispensation of the sacred mysteries of our Religion, as also in the direction of Christian manners, throughout the universal Church. To number and this them up in particular were too long a businesse for this small Treatise, especially having given in the precedent book, sufficient grounds of their necessity and lawfulness.

Amongst these truths we may also reckon another, which we briefly touched in the former book. To wit, That there is in the Church an authority to make laws in order to the perfecting of the sacred discipline in Ecclesiastical Government, and for the more convenient use, and practise of Divine and spiritual things. And it is evident, that whatsoever is of this nature, may be abrogated by the same authority by which it was constituted. In the Interim, all things that have been ordained by the Church, and are practised by an universal custome, do most certainly oblige all the Sons of the Church, to obey and submit unto them, as long as such ordinances are received and continue in vigor. For the Apostle doth command, *That all disobedience be readily punished* Yea saith he. *Obey those that are set over you, and submit your selves to them.* And again, commanding (S. Paul) to keep the precepts of the Apostles and of the Priests. Which is yet more Divinely expressed by these words: *It is thought*

There is a power in the Church to make laws.

4 Cor. 10.

Heb. 13.

Acts 5.

Acts 15.

fit unto the holy Ghost and unto us, that we impose no further burden upon you &c.

This Ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction, doth only extend it self unto holy things, or at most to what doth necessarily belong to holy things. And in these, not only all those things which being common to all Catholick Churches by unanimous consent, and general practise, are esteemed to have the force of a law; but also, all those things which are established and practised by the authority of every particular Church; for every particular Church hath its special rights and customs, which every member of each Episcopal congregation is obliged to keep, as being the sacred Canons & constitutions of a superiour authority.

Fast and Celibate to be observed.

The fast of Lent, and the celibate of Bishops and Priests, are held in the Catholick Church, to be of this universal tradition and constitution, whereof we speak. Some think the *fast of Lent* cannot be quit abolished, no not by the authority of the whole Church, because it is an Apostolical tradition. And to take quite away the *celibate*, or not marrying of Bishops and Priests throughout the whole Church, were very absurd, and inconvenient; as will easily appear to whomsoever shall consider the business seriously. Yet the Catholick Church did never acknowledge, that either of them had any divine institution or command.

Festivals daies are to be kept

Hence it followeth, that there are other several Catholick truths (which I intend not for the present to number up in particular) that are likewise universally received. As our obligation to *celebrate*

brate festival daies, which are religiously kept in pious employments, and free from all servil work either universally throughout the whole Church, or particularly in every one his own Congregation. The like is to be said of observing the fast of *virgils*, and *Imber weeks*. Wherefore *Aetius* cited already, who said that *fasts* were not to be kept; And the *Manicheans*, who contrarily said, that we ought to abstain wholly from wine and flesh, not because they are forbidden by the Church at certain times, but as being unclean things in themselves, and not ordained for mans food: These men, I say, have been condemned by the Church for these errors.

The like of Virgils & for Imber week.

There be likewise divers Ecclesiastical ordinances which are generally practised as rights and ceremonies in the adminiltration of the Sacraments, and in divers other Sacred actions, whereof some are common to all Churches, others proper to some particular Churches only, whereunto we are bound to give all due reverence and obedience, Although they do not immediately rely upon any revealed and Divine institution.

Concerning the truths of the second kind, I intend not to undertake to number them up, nor do I think it necessary to my purpose. Farther we believe, that it is forbidden to all Christians, even by the law of the Gospel, to have two wives at the same time: for saith the Gospel, *Whosoever doth put away his wife and marrieth another, doth commit adultery; And whosoever doth marry one that is put away from her husband, doth commit adultery. Whom God hath joyned let no man seperate.*

The second sort of these truths.

Plurality of wives forbidden to Christians.

Luke 16.

Mark 10.

1 Cor. 7.

*Whoſoever doth put away his wife and marrieth another, doth commit adultery with her. Or if a wife leave her husband, and marrieth to another, ſhe committeth adultery. To them who are joyned in marriage, I command, not I, but our Lord, that the wife ſhall not go from her husband, but if ſhe do go from him, that ſhe ſhall remain as unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. Let not the husband put away his wife. Whence it is, that the Church doth teach us, that the bond of marriage is not diſſolved be-
 cause of the adultery of one or both parties, for neither of them, not even the innocent party, who may have given no occasion of the Adultery, can contract marriage with any body else, as long as the other party liveth. Nay further, the Church teacheth us, that he himſelf is an adulterer, who putting away an adultereſſe wife, doth marry another. And the like of the wife who leaving her an Adulterer husband, is married to another. This Evangelical and Catholick, truth had divers adverſaries, whereof we have mentioned ſome few when we ſpoke of the Sacrament of marriage.*

Virginity is
 more excel-
 lent ſtate then
 marriage.

1 Cor. 7.

*To this truth doth follow another, to wit, That the ſtate of virginity is more perfect then the ſtate of marriage. Which Jovinianus, about the year, 420. did boldly oppoſe, I may ſay impudently, ſince that the Apoſtle doth often, and expreſſly teach us this truth, writing to the Corinthians; I ſay of un-married folks and widowers, that it is good for them if they remain ſo, as I myſelf do. An unmarried woman and a virgin doe think of ſuch things as belong to our Lord, that ſhe may be holy in
 body.*

body and soul. He that giveth not his virgin in marriage doth better. He shall be more happy, if he remain so. Yet doth the Apostle cautiously give this Counsel to the Corinthians, saying: *This I say for your good, not to cast a snare before you, but to perswade you to that which is honest, and which may give you means to serve your Lord without incumbrances.* And that this state of life was performed even in the times of the Apostles, S. Matthew doth testifie: *There be some Eunuches (saith he) who have made themselves Eunuches for the Kingdoms of heaven.* Wherefore to say that the state of Wedlock is to be preferred before the state of Virginity, or celibat, or that it is not happier and better to remain chaste in the state of Virginity and celibat, then to be married, is to be in a great error, opposite to the common belief and practise of the Catholick Church.

Matth. 19.

To this doth follow another Catholick truth, to wit, that *the vows* which the regulars or religious persons do make of *poverty, chastity, and obedience*, according to the severall constitutions made by divers holy men, and approved by the Church, are good and lawfull; so they be rightly performed and practised. I know there be many things disputed amongst our Catholick Divines, concerning the present use of vows; As of the *Solemnity* of them, of the privation which regulars incur by their vows of all propriety and power to dispose, without leave, of any temporal Goods (wherein many think the perfection of the vow of poverty doth consist,) and other such like things, which belongs not to our purpose

Vows are lawfull.

Psalm 104.

Isa. 19.

pose to examine. Nor do we maintain, as a Catholick truth, that the *discipline* of Regulars, is of *divine institution* and ordination, as it is now practised; but that it consisteth in certain pious rules of life, framed by several holy and religious men which when they are approved by the Church, we call *Ecclesiastical constitutions*. Vow (saith the Divine Psalmist) *and perform what you promise to your Lord God*. The like saith the Prophet speaking of those who were to live under the sweet yoke of the Evangelical law: *They shall make vows to the Lord and perform them*. How convenient and efficacious means these vows be for attaining unto Christian perfection, no experienced man can doubt, who doth but see and consider that such as make these vows, are persons separated from the people, and from all commerce with the world, bending their thoughts upon the service of God, and striving to lead a heavenly life even upon earth.

All hereticks have ever been mortal enemies of vows, both because their cupidity of living voluptuously, would never suffer them to submit to the rules of a strict life; As also, because for the most part, the heads and ringleaders of Schismes, and heresies, have been Apostatas, who have cast off, and thrown away, their regular and Religious habit.

No man is
absolutely
certain either
of his election
or of his per-
severance.

Here we may likewise add another truth, which is, the common belief and opinion of the whole Church, grounded upon divine tradition. Which is, that no man have an absolute certainty (without a special revelation) of his election, justifi-

justification, perseverance and eternal falvation. For every man who shall but seriously look into himself, and consider on the one side, his own misery and weaknesse, and on the other, the inscrutable secrets of Gods providence and judgments, may and ought doubt of his justification, perseverance, and falvation. As for the confidence which some men pretend to have, and by which they boast they are most certain (without all fear or possibility of doubt) of their election, justification, finall perseverance, and falvation, it is but a vain and airie imagination, and farr from the disposition of a pious & humble soul: for *Man doth not know, whether he be worthy of love or hatred, but all things are kept uncertain for the future. For a sin, for which thou thinkest God hath been propitious to thee, be not without fear.* Yea, the Apostle himself saith, *I am not guilty to my self of any thing yet am I not justified for this.* And again: *Thou standest by faith, be not too wise, but fear.* And again. *With fear and trembling you shall work your Salvation.* And again. *If any man think he standeth, let him look to it, that he doth not fall.* Whereby it is manifest, that all Christians are wholly uncertain not only of those things which are pre-ordained and predetermined of every particular man in the hidden judgments and secret decrees of Gods incomprehensible wisdom; but even of those internal operations, and spiritual effects, which every man doth think, are now and then produced and begot in his own soul, through the mercy and goodnesse of God. And whosoever is not of this belief, must needs be judged

Eccles. 9.

Eccles. 5.

1 Cor. 4.

Rom. 12.

Phil. 2.

1 Cor. 10.

judged by every prudent and intelligent man, to be deceived by the spirits of pride and ignorance.

That the
rewards of
Saints in Hea-
ven are un-
equal.

1 Cor. 15.

John 14.

There is yet another truth, which hath many adversaries, though it be the general belief of the Catholick Church, which is; *That the rewards of Saints in heaven, are not all of an equal degree.* Which the Apostle doth expressly testifie, saying: *Other is the brightnesse of the Sunne; other the brightnesse of Moone; other the brightnesse of the Stares; for as one Starr doth differ in brightnesse from another, and so shall it be in the resurrection of the dead.* And our Saviour saith: *In the house of my Father there be many mansions, or dwelling places.* True it is that all the Saints of heaven shall be happy for all eternity, by the blessed sight and knowledge of God in himself, yet shall they not all of them have the same degree of felicity; which seemstruly most reasonable. For the glory of the Saints in heaven, is to be given them as their wages or reward, and therefore to be measured with proportion to their charity and love of God which they had whilst they were upon earth: And being we know this love is of different degrees in divers persons, we cannot therefore doubt, but their glory must be likewise in different proportions.

Every one
hath an Angel
gardian.

Lastly, there is another truth received and approved by the common consent of the universal Church; And it is this, That through Gods special goodnesse and providence, every man, but especially every Christian, hath an *Angell keeper* or Gardian allotted him. There be divers things
in

in this point which it were not amisse to declare, were it not this short and compendious relation of these Catholick truths, will not suffer us to make so long a stay upon every particular.

First, we may suppose as most certain both by natural reason and by our Christian faith, that there are Angels, or incorporeal spirits, that is, void of all material and quantative dimensions. I know some who call themselves Christians, who profess they doubt of this truth. There be infinite numbers of places in the Scriptures, both in the old and new Testament, which do mention the immense number of Angels, which do speak their praises and glory, and their ministry in God his divine Government, and disposition of humane affaires. We are likewise taught by our Christian faith, that some Angels through their own fault fell into sin from that state of perfection in which they were created by Almighty God.

The first position is evident, I say, out of the Scriptures; *Dan. 7. Thousands of thousands did serve him, and ten thousand hundred of thousands did attend upon him.* And the same is repeated in almost the self same words *Apoca. 5. They are likewise called Messengers or administering spirits, Heb. 5.* In the old law there is often mention made of the admirable helps which the Divine goodnesse did in those times impart unto men by the means of Angels. *Isau* was delivered from the fatal blow of his father *Abraham* his sword, by an Angel; *Gen. 22. Lot* from *Sodom*, *Gen. 19.* The three children or servants from the fiery fur-

That there are Angels is Proved.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

nace, *Dan. 3.* Daniel himself in the denn from the mouth of the Lion. *Dan. 6.* An Angel rebukes *Balam*, *Num. 22.* Another threatneth the *Israelits*. *Jud. 2.* Another strikes the Army of the *Assyrians*, *Reg. 4. 19.* Another dissipates the Army of *Sennacherib*, *Paralip. 2. 32.* A *Seraphin* toucheth *Isaiab* his mouth with a cole, *Isa. 6.* Another waketh *Elias* from sleep, and gives him meat. *Reg. 3. 19.* The Angel *Raphael*, cureth *Tobias*, *Tob. 3.* The Angel *Michael* fights with the Devil, *Dan. 10.* *Jud. 9.* *Apoca. 1. 7. 8.* There be infinite other places in the old Testament which clearly witnesse the service of Angels towards men. The new Testament also doth no lesse testifie the same truth. An Angel delivered *St. Peter* from his chaines, and brought him out of prison. *Acts 12.* And in the same place, *Herod* is struck by an Angel. An Angel descended into the pool, moved the waters, and cured the infirm. *Ioh. 5.* An Angel is sent to the Eunuch, *Acts. 8.* *Cornelius*, sent for *St. Peter* by the command of an Angel. *Acts. 10.* Nay even in the mystery of the Incarnation and Passion of *Jesus Christ*, we know for certain by the scripture, that an Angel was imployed. *Gabriel* saluted the B. Virgin *Mary*, and announced unto her the conception of *Jesus* the Son of God by the holy Ghost: *Luc 1.* An Angel brought the happy tidings of our Saviours birth to the Shepherds *Luc. 2.* An Angel admonished *Joseph* in his sleep, to flye into *Aegypt*, and to return back; *Mat. 2.* Our Saviour *Jesus Christ* himself said, *I can ask my Father, and he will give me more then twelve legions of Angels*, *Mat. 4.* There did appear unto him
(out

(our Saviour) *an Angel from heaven comforting him* Luc. 22. In the great day of Judgment the Angels will wait upon Christ at his comming: *He will send his Angels with a Trumpet, &c. And they will gather the elect, &c.* Mat. 24. *In the voice of an Angel, &c.* 1 Thesal. 4. And in the *Apocalipse*, The ministry and operations of Angels, are every where mentioned.

That some of the Angels did fall into sin, is no lesse clear out of the Scriptures. *Job 4. And he found wickedness in his Angels. And Job. 15. The heavens are not clean in his sight. Isa. 14. How cam'st thou to fall from heaven Lucifer, who did'st rise so early: Ezech 28. Thou Cherub &c. Until iniquity was found in thee, and thou did'st sin, and I cast thee down from the Hill of God, and destroyed thee, O Cherub. &c. Joh. 8. You are from the Devil your father, &c. who was a murderer from the beginning and did not continue in the truth. 2. Pet. 2. For if God did not spare his Angels sinning, &c. Jud. 6. The Angels who did not conserve their principality, but left their habitation, &c. And many other such places.*

That some Angels did fall into sin.

There be also divers other places in the holy Scriptures, which do clearly signifie, that every man is committed to the special tuition of an Angel, as *Exod. 23. Behold I will send my Angel, who shall go before thee in the way, and shall bring thee to the place which I have provided for thee: observe him and hear his voice, and do not think he is to be despised, who will not leave thee when thou shalt sin, &c. And my Angel shall go before thee, &c.* Where is expressly signified the care of an Angel, conducting

That every one hath an angel is shewed out of the Scripture.

and keeping man by the commandement of God. And Psal. 90. *God commanded his Angels over thee, that they should keep thee in all thy waies, &c* And Mat. 18. *See that you do not despise one of these little ones, for I say unto you, their Angels in heaven do alwaies see the face of my father.* These and many other testimonies of the holy scriptures, did so convince even *Calvin* himself, of the assistance of Angels towards men, that he doth expressly confesse in the 3. institut. c. 20: That Angels ought to be invocated.

Now I hope I have sufficiently opened the way for all our adversaries to say with *S. Austin* l. 6. confess. c. 3. *I did rejoycing blush to see that I had barked so many years, not against the Catholick faith but against the fained imaginations of my own carnal cogitations; for I had been so rash and wicked, that I said those things by way of accusation, which I ought to have learnt by way of enquiry.*

Finally, dear reader, I thought it fit to advertise thee here, that I have purposely omitted to cite the authors who maintain all those Theological assertions, whereof I have made mention in every particular article, and which I have likewise said are disputed by our Catholick divines on both sides; being unwilling to fill this small treatise with the citations of many writers, clashing one against another, or to alleage their words and quote the places. And I have also done the like in briefly and slightly relating the vain imaginations of our adversaries, without citing many particulars, that is, not specifying every one of our adversaries singular opinion, and the
disse-

differences of one from another in the same subject; because this would have bulked up a volume by such a full and exact citation of all their words and places, contrary to my designe. This I leave to those who are accustomed to stuffe up their voluminous tomes with long and tedious repetitions, relations, and explications of many airy, and imaginary questions; nay even with transcriptions (like as many copists or scriveners) of all mens opinions, though never so uncertain, and of all their reasons and arguments, though never so foolish. Yet I have thought it fit, to insert briefly here, what I should have put in the very beginning of this book, that is, an explication of certain words, which those who censure books, and propositions of *Divinity* do ordinary use, which shall be the subject of the following Paragraph.

One only Paragraph.

Of the proper signification of such words or terms as are commonly used in the censures of Theologicall propositions.

WE see that certain assertions or propositions which have some relation to Divine faith and Religion, but more nearly belong to the science of Divinity, are sometimes censured by our school Divines too boldly with this note, that they resent heresie, or are neer unto heresie.

Now by what means such propositions ought
to

What it is for
a proposition
to resent he-
resie, or to be
neer unto
heresie.

to be thus censured, and upon what principles we ought to rely in thus censuring them, so as that they be said, to be justly and worthily censured and reprehended, I conceive it doth sufficiently appear by evident sequel out of what we have already said in the first book, c.6. and 9.^o for unlesse such assertions be found to be clearly opposite, either to the articles of our Catholick faith, or to such truths as are generally known and commonly acknowledged to follow most certainly and most evidently (no Catholick gain-saying it) out of our revealed Doctrine; clear it is, that we cannot justly say, that such propositions do, *resent heresie, or are near unto heresie*. For being that this Judgment or censure (if neither of our suppositions be admitted) depends only upon the ratiocination and discourse of the censurer, whether one or more, what may by him or them seem worthy of this censure, and to be thus condemned; by another or others may be approved and maintained as good and sound doctrine.

What it is for
a proposition
to be Teme-
rarious.

There is another word or term, to wit, rash or *temerarious*, which must be explicated. We have some later Divines who call this or that to- to easily rash or *temerarious*. *Temerarious*, is derived from *Temerity*. Those things are said to be done with *Temerity* and rashnesse, which are not done by the Government of reason, either because of some violent immoderation in the *will*, or out of contempt; and therefore *temerity*, proceeds from pride. *Temerity* is likewise said to be a *precipitation*, for want of taking Councel; and therefore is a kind of *Imprudence*. Wherefore an asser-
tion

tion or proposition may be understood to be *temerarious* in two senses, either by comparing it to the internal and intrinsecal principles, whereupon it is built, and doth rely; or to the external authority of others. In the first sense it is very hard to censure any extraordinarily-learned Divines opinion of *Temerity*. For whether the internal principles whereupon a very learned and wise Divine doth build his opinion, be truly slight and weak, is only to be judged by extraordinary skilful, and no way preoccupied Divines; which how rare they are to be found in these daies, I need not say.

Temerarius is said two waies
Either asserted
upon slight
principles, Or
in opposition
to some au-
thority.

As for the second sense, wherein this word *temerarious* may be taken, it is to be noted, that the authority in respect whereof, the opposite opinion is said to be *temerarious*, is an authority superiour, and that either by reason of its jurisdiction; or by reason of the true and general esteem of Christians, or by reason of the numerical multitude of the school Divines of these times, who hold the contrary.

As for the authority which is superior by reason of its jurisdiction, it is certainly of as much force & value in order to the condemnation of such an opinion, as is the jurisdiction it self in the esteem of learned, wise, & pious men. And the chief value of this authority doth mainly consist in tis extensions. So that if the jurisdiction of this authority be generally held by all Catholicks to be universal (as of a general Council) then to maintain any thing, acknowledged opposit to its decrees, is truly *temerarious*. But as for disobedience, or standing out

This authority
is threefold.

out to maintain an opinion against the authority and sentence of any particular superior, that doth only involve such a degree of *temerity*, as the particular circumstances are disposed to attribute to such an opposition or contumacy, according to the rules of prudence. For it is not to be alwaies thought, that because a particular superior authority or jurisdiction (what ever it be) doth declare this or that opinion to be *temerarious*, therefore it is presently to be judged to be so indeed; But it must appear that such an opinion doth in effect stand in opposition to, and is condemned by an *universal authority*.

It is very certain, in my opinion, that there be some doctrinal points and positions in Divinity, which are of no small force, in that precisely they rely upon an authority, which doth consist in the true and general esteem of the testimony of the antient Saints and doctors of the Church. That is, such opinions as are truly established upon the common consent of the *Fathers* (though no articles of faith) are in this respect onely, of no small authority. For although it is no argument of *temerity* to oppose the opinion of some particular Saintly man, or antient father (especially if we know him to dissent from the rest of the fathers in that point) neverthelesse it seems to me, that no man can wilfully oppose the unanimous consent of the holy fathers in a point of Divinity, without some note of *Temerity*.

Lastly, some think there is a considerable authority in the multitude of later Divines, conspiring in the same opinion; who since they
pro-

profess to dispute all things doubtfully & problematically (whether it be in questions concerning the exposition of the sacred text, or concerning any consequence drawn from our revealed doctrine) their authority in my opinion, is not considerable at all. Yes, I hold it lawful to oppose a whole torrent of these Schepticks, without the least blemish of temerity.

There be also other terms, as *false* and *erroneous* wherewith we sometimes see the opinions of most learned and most Catholick Divines are branded. For there by many Divines in this age, who easily bolt out their censures against any doctrine that is not their own. *Erroneous*, is derived from *error*; And *error*, as also *untruth* or *falsity*, is a proposition, opposite to truth. To *err* (saith S. Austin) is to affirm false things for truths, or deny true things or false; or to believe uncertainties as certainties, or certainties as uncertainties. We likewise know that there be *errors* opposite to such truths, as do regard the internal assent or dissent of the mind. As also, that there be *errors* in such things as do consist in the exterior practise of our external operations. Wherefore every *error* or *falsity* doth desume its degree of malignity from the nature of the subject wherein it is found. An *error* in faith, that is, in things either divinely revealed, or divinely instituted, is *heresie*, if perversly maintained. An *error* in religious worship whether it have only relation to the internal assent of the mind, or to the external exercise of the action, is by so much the more pernicious, by how much it doth tend to the destruction of

What it is to be Erroneous and false.

An error is more or lesse dangerous according to the divers qualities of the subject wherein it is,

some chief head and principle act of Religion. An *error* in Divinity, that is, which is contrary to a Theological truth, known to be such by a clear and evident ratiocination, is not altogether so dangerous, unless by some other way, and by evil consequences, it come to be aggravated. An *error* which is only opposite to some natural truth doth belong to philosophy, and it is not to my purpose.

To whom it
doth belong
to judge of
erreurs.

It belongs not to every man to judge of the crime of *error* and *falsity* in every subject. Of *errors* in faith and Religion, it doth only belong to the whole universal Church to judge certainly and *infallibly*. as for the judgments of particular men, whether it be of a Prelate within his precinct, or of divers divines gathered together, they are of that force and value which we have already ascribed to their decrees and sentences against temerarious opinions. As for *errors* and *falsities* of consequences in matters of doctrine, which are discussed in our schools, such only ought to judge of them, as are truly able to demonstrate most evidently, and to convince most certainly, that such opinions as they undertake to condemn of *error* and *falsity*, are in effect guilty thereof. Whence it is evident, that such opinions as are held doubtful by divers learned divines in the Church, ought not to be censured as *erroneous* and *false*. Nor those opinions neither, which seem not to have been as yet sufficiently discussed, exactly enquired into, and diligently examined. Which sure can only be performed by those whose sacred authority, free from all prece-

preoccupation, and whose extraordinary bearing free from all faction, do make worthy and fit for this employment.

There are yet these words or terms, *scandalous and offensive to pious ears*, which we must explicate. And first certainly, these terms ought only to be understood of and applied unto such propositions as truly give occasion of *scandal* and offence: For such opinions as only give *scandal* to the rude and ignorant without just cause, ought not to be branded with this censure. For the truth (as St. Thomas of Aquine saith) ought not to be deserted by reason of the passive scandal which some may take. Opinions are commonly said to be *scandalous and offensive to pious cares*, by reason of some *novelty* which seems to be opposite either to some common tenet in doctrine, or to some usual practise in Religious worship; or at least whereby some unquoth & accustomed thing is either begun quite anew, or renewed; And this in something which hath relation to Religion, whether it concern only an internal assent of the understanding, or some external religious practise. All opinions ought not to be judged *scandalous and offensive to pious cares* precisely because they are opposite to some vulgar and common tenet generally held in Schools; or to some common practise generally in use amongst devout people. For although such opinions may seem to have something of *novelty* in them, because they are contrary to the more common doctrine of later Divines, or more frequent practise of devotes in these times: yet because it

What it is for a position to be scandalous or offensive to pious ears.

There be two
sorts of noval-
ties for which
positions may
be said to be
scandalous.

is manifest to all knowing men, that there be many abuses crept into the discipline of our Christian and Catholick Religion, and many untruths into the phantasies of the people, yea, and even into the Schools of Divinity; we must therefore sometimes, though discreetly, recal into the minds of men, and renew the oracles of the antient fathers in Theological points, as also their holy customes in Religious worship, which are now much decayed, nay almost quite extinct. And this certainly ought not to displease any, unlesse it be such as are either in effect unlearned, or do favour the licentiousness of these times. And we further say, that it is necessary (according to the Churches custome in general Councils) to take away the growing abuses in sacred things, to labour all we may in prudence, to revive the antient sentiments of the holy fathers, and the old and pious customes of the primitive times. But if we see any thing practised which is altogether new, and of a late invention in a matter any way belonging to Religion, whether it be in any exercise of Divine worship, or only concerning the assent of our understanding; we may with more reason conceive that such a thing is *scandalous and offensive to pious ears*: yet with this caution, unlesse it evidently tend to the good of soules, that is, to a more strict and perfect observance of the holy Canons, ordained for Christian discipline or that it do proceed from the commandement of a superior authority.

What of the
words Impi-
ous and Sedi-
tious.

As for these words *Impious and seditious*, we need not trouble our selves; for *Impious* doth reach to

to all things that are wicked and abominable, whether it be in matters belonging to our Christian faith and Religion, or in any other subject common to mankind, or any way appertaining to mens manners. And for *Seditious*, it hath no particular relation to Ecclesiastical discipline, which is not also common to civil Government; and therefore it belongs not to my purpose to examine these terms any further.

The ninth Chapter.

Of certain natural truths which in the practise of Christian faith, a Religion ought to be kept and observed by all Catholicks whatsoever, as being indissolveable and indispenfable, by any authority upon earth, of what quality soever.

The constant experience and common consent of mankind, doth sufficiently manifest that the nature of man is to be *reasonable*, so as that it is absolutely impossible to find the true nature of man, without finding an innate faculty of *ratiocination*.

And being the power to reason and discourse is essentially common to all men; it followeth, that whosoever is evidently and necessarily agreeing to *reason*, must likewise be commonly and necessarily convenient to all men.

There be two principal truths naturally ingrafted in the most intime *Being* of every reasonable creature, and which are, as it were the *Basis* and ground of all the rest; and they are these: 1. *That there*

What is necessarily connexed with Reason, is common to mankind.

Two chiefe naturall truths

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

there is a God or first cause of all things. 2. That the form or rational soul of man is immortal. Upon these two principles, most intinely fixed in humane nature, are built all other truths which are common to mankind.

What is moral
good and mo-
ral evil,

Hence it follows, that all the titles of absolute perfection, do belong in a degree infinitely above the heighest pitch of mans comprehension to this first being, God. Secondly, that an eternity either of blisse, or woe, shall befall every rational and immortal soul after this life. For since that every rational creature is bound by the essential principles of its owne nature, to moderate and govern its life according to the square and rule of reason (wherein that which we call *moral good*, and in the opposite thereunto, that which we call *moral evil* doth consist) we cannot doubt, but the soul, being freed from the body, shall receive a recompence, according to the merit of her comportment upon earth, which shall last for ever.

From hence likewise doth spring (as we have already noted) the root of that which we call *Religion* or divine worship. And we have also supposed above, that *Christian religion* is the only true, rational, and necessary Religion, wherein mankind, generally speaking, can obtain eternal salvation.

What are the
laws of na-
ture.

These tenets thus settled, we are now to find out, which be those general truths and laws, which are so common to all men whatsoever, as that we may rightly condemn him of sin against nature it self, who shall dissolve or transgresse any of them. And we now look only after such truths

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

truths or laws, as have relation to the manners of men, that is whereunto they are to direct their lives, as to the right rule of reason. As for such truths as belong to sciences, and to those speculative principles which onely concern the internal assents of our understandings, they doe no way belong to what we aime at for here we intend only by the law of nature those things that are the dictamens of reason, and which therefore men ought to observe as being the chief and common principles of natural reason.

We will divide such truths and laws as we now seek after, into three classes or ranks, according to the triple duty of man, that is, in regard of the three fold relation wherein man may be considered, and whereunto he may be compared, in respect of his *moral goverment* and actions for all humane and moral actions, do either look up-*God*, upon the *Agent himself*, or upon *his neighbour*. Vnder these three titles, we will only consider those laws and truths, which (as we said but now) are so natural unto man, as that he that should swarve from them, should be justly condemned by all men as a delinquent against the light of nature (whose laws are altogether *indispensable*) and to erre from the clear path of evident reason.

The laws of nature are of three sorts.

It is manifest, that to whatsoever man is inclined according to his nature, as he is man, that must needs belong to the law of nature. Now every thing is naturally inclined to that operation, which is convenient unto it, according to its essential form, as fire to burne. Wherefore
being

What is it to be a law of nature.

being that a rational soul is the proper and essential form of man; It must needs follow, that there is a natural inclination in every man, to act according to reason which is to act according to virtue, or virtuously. Wherefore we call that *good*, which a reasonable creature, as he is reasonable, doth desire as his end. Whence it is, that all the precepts of the law of nature (which are many in themselves) are contained in this one; *Good is to be followed; Evil is to be eschewed.*

The difference
between the
law of nature,
and the right
of nature.

We are to note here two things: 1. That we call *that* the law of nature, which all mankind is universally obliged to perform: But *that* we call the right of nature, which all men may lawfully do for their own good. 2. That there be certain things forbidden, because they are evil. Of which sort are all humane actions which are contrary to those morall truths and principles, which are essentially consentaneous to humane nature. And there be other things which are only evil, because they are forbidden, that is, because there doth supervene some command of a superior, or some other external circumstance in relation to some action, which of its own nature is indifferent, which we shall illustrate with examples hereafter.

The first class
of the laws of
nature relate
to God.

To proceed according to the tryple order of these three sorts of humane actions, we may first suppose as certain that *Atheists*, who deny that there is any first cause, any God, any Creator, do mainly offend against the truths and laws of the first order. As also those who do not adore with supream worship, called *Latria*, one only God,

God, Sovereigne Lord of all things ; Or who give this Divine honor to any thing els, and are therefore rightly called, *Idolators*. And not much unlike to these are witches and superstitious people ; As also those who swear in vain, or slightly, and needlessly call God to witnesse upon any small and trifeling occasion. Much more those who do forswear themselves, and make God a witnesse of a lye. And lastly, all those who hate God, upon what consideration soever ; who blaspheme and curse him. All these, I say, do sin most grievously against a truth, and law which is clear by the light of nature, and evident reason ; from the obligation whereunto, no Religion whatsoever can exempt any man.

Against the truths, and laws of the second order, those do principally offend, who kill themselves. For being the preservation of ones self, is grounded in nature, as its chief right and supream law, it is evident, that all things which tend to ones own destruction, are wholly unlawful and forbidden. Where it is to be noted, that as God onely is the first cause, so is he only Lord of life and death. Yet how it may be lawful to cause anothers death, we will examine presently. In the interim it is manifest, that all such things as are truly and absolutely necessary to preserve ones life, may be lawfully and justly done by any man considered in the pure state of nature, that is, before any Covenant or society be made. Whence it is clear, that all such actions of men, as do generally, and of their own nature give life, either to the Agent himself, or to ano-

The second
Classse of the
laws of nature
relate to our
selves.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

ther, if done after such a manner as that they cannot produce their due and convenient effect, are wholly unlawful and forbidden by the law of nature. As appears in all those who work any filthiness upon themselves. The like is to be understood of all such actions as do wholly hinder, or take quite away the use of reason; for these actions do destroy the very nature of man, whether they proceed from the immoderate cupidity of the interior appetite, as in luxurious, cholerick, and proud people; or from the allurements of some exterior cause; as in those who are given to gluttony and drunkenesse. I intend not to number up all the kinds of these actions in this place: It is sufficient for my purpose, that all these truths and laws in general are so intinely rooted in the essence of rational nature, as that without the subversion of the whole world, and destruction of mankind, they must necessarily remain wholly *indissolweable*, and to be ever constantly observed by every man of what Religion soever he be, which cannot be a true one, if opposite to these.

The third
classe of the
laws of nature
relate to our
neighbour.

Humane actions
may be
considered
two waies.

It is much harder to assign and specify the laws and truths of the third order; because the condition of man considered in the state of pure nature, is farr different from what he is, as we now see him every were placed.

Let us consider what is to be said of man in the first of these states, and conditions, which we may do two waies, either by comparing every particular man, to every particular man; or every particular man, to the whole multitude of men in this state of pure nature. In like manner, the actions

actions of men in this state may be considered in themselves either as they are opposite to the negative laws of a reasonable creature, & therefore *evil*; or as they ought to be such as the positive law of the same creature doth oblige him to perform, and then the failing or omitting of them, is likewise *evil*. The former sort of actions are said to be contrary to a negative precept, as, *thou shalt not kill*. The second sort to a positive precept, as, *love thy neighbour as thy self*.

Now, as we have said already, being that the first principle of all, and the most deeply rooted in nature, is, that every on may, and is bound to preserve himself; so likewise may we add two other principles equally common to this, and as deeply rooted in the nature of a reasonable creature. The one *positive*, the other *negative*, which cannot be better expressed then in the words of holy Scripture : *What ever you would have other men to do unto you, do you unto them*; for this is the law and the Prophets. Mat. 7. *What thou wouldest not love that another shall do unto thee, see that thou dost never do the same unto another*. Tob. 4. Wherefore, it is manifest that the love of our neighbour is not only a commandement of the Evangelical and Moysaical law, but that it is a precept of the law of nature. For though, as the philosopher saith, Eth. 9. *Such things as we love to do to another proceed from hence, that we love they should be done to us in like case*. Yet so necessary, and immutable is the connexion of these two principles as that there is nothing more intime and innate to a reasonable creature, then the love of his

The law of nature relating to our neighbour considered in common is twofold.

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

neighbour (supposing it stand with his own preservation) even in vertue of his creation and first being.

But he that doth professe the name of Christ, and would be esteemed a Christian, let him hearken unto the Evangelist whom Jesus loved: *In this all men shall know that you are my disciples, if you doe love one another.* John 13. & 1 Pet. 4. *Before all things have mutual and continual charity amongst your selves, &c.* And 1 John 3. *Who doth not love remaines in death.*

The order of
natural love
towards our
neighbour.

Now we are to find out in what order and in what manner we are bound by the law of nature to this love and good will towards our neighbour. For since that every man is neereſt to himself, we may and ought to love our selves, that is, wiſh and doe good to our selves before all others; so that to procure anothers safety with the ruine and destruction of himself, no man was ever bound to it. Wherefore this natural precept of loving our neighbour, is not to be understood of doing or procuring any good to another of the ſame kinde, and in the ſame circumſtances, as it may be needfull to our selves.

We are obliged to doe
good to our
neighbour
two wayes.

We are therefore bound by the law of nature to doe good to our neighbour two manner of wayes. First, when our neighbour wants goods, wherewith we abound. That is, one copiously abounding with ſomething whereof his neighbour doth ſtand in need, is bound to make him partaker thereof. *He that hath the riches of this world, and ſees his neighbour in want, and ſhuts his bowels*

bowels of mercy from him, how doth the love of God remain in him ? 1 John 3. Yet is this to be understood according to the measure of the abundance of the one, and of the necessity of the other ; which would be too long for this place to examine in particular. Secondly, when the *goods* whereof the one doth stand in need, are of a higher nature then those wherewith the other may procure them. For example, a man rich in the *goods of fortune*, is obliged to bestow them for the preservation of the *life* of a poore man. Yea we are bound to expose, and give our temporal lives, when it is absolutely necessary, to another for his attaining to eternal life. But in the same kind of *goods*, one cannot be obliged to bestow upon another that which is truly and really necessary for the preservation of himself.

Now, whereas we said above, that God only *is Lord of life and death*, and likewise, that this is to be causiously and rightly understood, we are to consider, that all reasonable men doe acknowledge, that no man of what quality or condition soever, can **take another mans life** from him without a just and equitable cause ; yet is it no lesse evident, that there is one cause or reason, and only one, for which it is lawful to put another to death.

How it is lawful to kill, or cause another mans death.

For still I repeat and affirm, that it is the first of Lawes to preserve ones selfe, and therefore whatever may occurre opposite to this, it must yield and give way to it. He therefore that cannot preserve himself, unlesse he take a-
nother

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

nother mans life from him; he, I say, is, for this time, Lord of that other mans life. Which principle, where there is a society contracted, doth with more right belong to the Magistrate, for the preservation of the peace and safety of the whole society, as I shall declare by and by.

Now this is
to be under-
stood.

Although this truth of every mans having power and right over another mans life, be most certain by the law of nature, and most manifest by the light of reason; yet it is not so easie to mark out a *particular case* or state, wherein it may be lawfully put in execution, as it is to be convinced of the *hypothesis*, or supposition in common. For it were absurd and unworthy of a man of common sense to say, that every half-witted, phantastick, or light-brained man (not to speak of Idiots and mad men) may justly and according to the law of reasonable nature, kill another, even before any Society be covenanted, because he shall imagine or conceive unto himself foolishly, and without any apparent ground or likelihood, that he cannot live in security, as long as such or such a man is alive. Wherefore, to put the judgment of every particular case, into every individual mans power, of what capacity, constitution, or complexion soever he be, so as that every man, in every occurrence, shall be the supreme and last definitive Judge of his own danger, and thence Lord of another mans life, is in effect to destroy nature, and extinguish the light of reason.

The rules of
this truth.

Wherefore, the rule and measure of this truth is, that the certainty of the *thesis*, or position of this

this eminent danger, in its particular case or occurrence, must be as manifest to common sense, and as evident to the natural reason of all men, to whom it may be propounded, as is the truth of the supposition in general. So as that he who shall take away another mans life in the defence of his own, ought to be ready to appeal to mankind, and to the common sense of all men, as the proper Judge of his fact, whereunto he will submit.

This concerning the duty of man towards his neighbour, grounded in the right of pure nature, before all Covenant or Society, is clearly evident out of the two principles which we have alledged. And further, in those two principles (which make onely one Commandement, to wit, *Good is to be followed, Evil is to be eschewed*) are comprehended all the precepts of the law of nature, which are many in themselves, according to the several relations of the love we owe to our neighbour, which are all called *moral precepts*, because they concern the manners of men, and are set down in the second Table of the *Decalogue*. For those precepts which belong to the first Table of the *Decalogue*, that is, to the love of God, we have sufficiently treated of them already, in as much as befits our purpose.

The duty of man towards his neighbour in particular.

Amongst the divers sorts of humane actions which have relation to our neighbour, the first and chief duty of man is towards *his parents*. For if we suppose men to come into the world by generation, clear it is, that such begotten children are bound by the law of nature to honour

The duty of man towards his parents.

nour their parents ; as in their childhood and youth to obey them, then, if need be, to relieve their necessities, and help them in all things, so far as reason shall require. Much more is it forbidden by the same law to kill our parents, yea to contemn them, hate them, or any way hurt them in word or deed.

Thou shalt not kill, is a law of nature.

Further also it is clear and evident, that in what manner soever we suppose men to come into the world, so we suppose them to be men, all murther, or wilful & unjust killing of one another (I say *unjust*, because, in manifest danger of evident necessity of our own, or the publicks preservation, it is not *unjust*) is forbidden by the law of nature. Nor can any man at his pleasure, or without a just and lawful cause (which is only, I say, in the manifest danger of ones own, or the publicks destruction) kill another. And the reason is, because such a killing (as we have already shewed) would be *unjust*. And killing is onely forbidden by the law of nature, as it is *unjust*, being we have declared that a private man in defence of his own life, which he cannot otherwise preserve, may kill his enemy. Much more is it lawful for a hangman to put a malefactor to death, as an enemy of the Commonwealth, which the Magistrate cannot otherwise preserve and keep in safety. For this, I still say, is not *murther*, or an *unjust killing*, contrary to the law of nature, and the light of reason, which only is forbidden by the Law.

Hence it followeth, that it is likewise forbidden by the same law, and in the same circumstances,

stances, not to lame, wound, hurt, or use any violence to our neighbour. Yea, all voluntary acts of hatred, envy, revenge, although proceeding from choller or indignation, are forbidden by the same Law. *Everyone that hateth his brother, is a murderer,* 1 Joh. 3. Whence, not only to wish the death of our neighbour, but even to *rejoyce at his evil*, or to be *sorry for his good*, are things directly opposite to the dictamen of the law of nature, and the light of reason.

To these we may annex, as forbidden by the same law, all things contrary to natural honesty, or chastity: As all filthinesse of carnal luxury, as well such as may be committed by the concupiscence of the mind, as in words or deeds; for example, fornication, adultery, incest, deflo-ration, rape, and all inordinate uncleanness, which are too filthy to be named.

The vices of luxury are against the law of nature.

It is likewise forbidden by the same law, to lye or dissimulate; for it is not lawful, no not in the state of pure nature, either to affirm in words, or to expresse in deeds, any thing against the truth. And whatsoever of this nature may redound to the prejudice of another, doth involve in it the iniquity both of untruth and injustice. So that, by this law of nature are not onely forbidden all false accusations of crimes, backbiting and contumelious injuries in words, but also all flattery and adulation; yea, and even the concealing of a truth, whereof sometimes men are obliged by the very law of nature, to give testimony, in what state soever we suppose them to be.

The same of lying.

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

How theft is
against the
law of nature.

Here we are to note, that although in the state of pure nature, that is, before any society be covenanted, no man can challenge any particular thing, exteriour to his own person, as due and proper to him alone, being that every man in that state, hath an equal right to the whole world. Neverthelesse, since that no man can possesse and enjoy the whole earth all alone, and that many whom we suppose to be endowed with humanity and reason, cannot so excessively desire the self-same part and portion of the earth, as that they would, for its sake, kill one another (in case we do not suppose there were more men then the whole earth were able to feed and maintain, it must needs fall out, according to the right rule of reason (as we know it did happen to *Abraham* and *Lot*, *Gen. 13.*) that one would take the right hand, the other the left; and so every one would go about to appropriate unto himself some part of the earth. But what right the quality of *first possessor* of any part would supervene to him that should first settle himself in it, is not material for the present. This supposed, if any man should by force and violence, against the owners will, take away from another any part thus acquired, that is, wherewith he were maintained, and which he had made his own by use and industry; such an one would doe *unjustly*, even before any Society covenanted. Wherefore, all kind of *theft*, deceit, circumvention, fraudulent craft, and all other kind of injustice, are forbidden by the law of reasonable nature. Whence it is manifest, that almost all *moral* virtues,

tues, especially those which we call *Cardinal* virtues, are due, and doe belong to rational nature, in what state soever we consider it.

Lastly, man is obliged by the law of nature common to every reasonable and humane creature by such a bond, *as cannot be dissolved by any created authority whatsoever*, to keep and observe his *promise* given, and his *covenant* made. This is the ground of all Kingdomes, Common-wealths, Societies, and Communities whatsoever; which unless we grant, and settle it as an immutable, certain, and infallible truth, the whole fabrick of mankind must needs perish.

Man is bound to stand to his promise by the law of nature.

A *promise*, doth differ from a *bargain* or *covenant* in this, that in a *bargain* or *covenant* the obligation is reciprocal; but in a *promise*, the fidelity of the promiser is only bound; yet both of them are of the same nature, and almost the same conditions do belong to them both.

How a promise differs from a pact or covenant.

A *promise*, and a *bargain* or *covenant*, may be made either nakedly, and without any further obligation, or with an *oath*: But however they be made, the bond of both of them is altogether *indispensable*. We will briefly set down the nature of the one and the other, and with what conditions they ought to be made, so as to be lawful, and to oblige immutably.

what is a promise.

A *promise* is an act of reason, whereby one man doth oblige himself to doe something for another. Now the chief function of reason, is to order and ordain what is to be done. By *promising* therefore, man doth ordain what he ought to doe for another, whether such a promise be

X x 2

made

made by word of mouth, or by any other external sign. Wherefore, every *promise* doth proceed from a *purpose* to doe something, and every *purpose* doth presuppose some *deliberation*, being an act of the will made with deliberation. The *deliberation* therefore begins, the *purpose* followeth, and the *promise* superveneth.

conditi.
of a pro- *A promise* therefore ought to be in him that promiseth *reasonable*, *deliberate*, and *willing*, or *free*. The first, because it is an act of reason: The second, because it is an act of a deliberate will: And the third, because absolute necessity doth destroy free will. As if one should promise that he would die, or the like, which were not in his power to hinder.

Further, the thing promised ought to be *possible*, because evident reason doth require it to be so. It ought to be *grateful* or *acceptable* to him to whom it is made, because otherwise it would be a threatning. It ought to be lawful, for *Jephthe* was inconsiderate in promising, and impious in performing his promise: As also *Herod*, *Mat. 14*. And lastly, it ought to be so made, as that at the time of performance of it, all things should remain unchanged; that is, all the conditions of the persons and circumstances of the businesse, must remain unvaried. As for example, a man in perfect health may promise divers things, which in sicknesse he is not obliged, nor cannot perform.

These conditions observed, it doth belong to the *trust and fidelity* of every man, to perform what he promiseth. And in vertue of any promise

mife thus made, one man is *indispensably* obliged to another according to *honesty*.

When to a *promise* we adde an *oath*, that is, when any man doth call God to witnesse of his *promise*, the obligation is the greater. And an oath ought to be made, when *necessity* requireth it, with *judgment*, with *truth*, and with *justice*; which when it is *promissory*, or bearing promise, and hath relation to the future, it doth inferre a most strict obligation.

What is a promising oath, and what its conditions.

Now, as we said of a *promise*, so must we say of an *oath bearing promise*, to wit, that it ought to be *voluntary* and free. For a compelled and forced oath, contrary to a mans *honesty* or *utility* (if the utility be necessary for his life who promiseth) is of no value. For every obligation, whether from a *promise*, or from an *oath*, violently extorted by force, doth presently cease: Because, he that infers violence, deserveth that what *promise* or *oath* soever is made unto him in consequence thereof, should not be kept; yea, it is evident, that the Magistrate may declare the bond and obligation of such a *promise* or *oath bearing promise*, to be of no value. For it would redound to the prejudice and ruine of publick justice, if it were admitted in the Commonwealth as lawful for any man to offer violence to another when he can and pleaseth, and thence violently extort a *promise* from him, which shall be of obligation.

What is to be said of a forced oath or promise.

Yet is it to be noted, that when we said that an *oath* extorted upon unjust and forced conditions, is *dissolvable*, or *dispensable*. It is not to be under-

How an oath is indissolvable.

understood, that such a dispensation doth extend it self, so as that any thing may be done contrary to an oath; for this cannot be, since that an *oath* is of obligation by divine right, and consequently *indissoluble* in it self; but that that which before was of obligation under *oath*, is now no longer of obligation in vertue of that *oath*, the due matter of the *oath* being no longer the same that it was, by reason of the mutation of some circumstance: And the reason is, because that that which considered in it self is good, profitable, and honest, may become evil, hurtful, and dishonest in some particular circumstance. For example, a young man may come to swear rashly that he will never marry; and afterwards it comes to passe, that he suffereth such temptations of the flesh, as that he is in danger to become unchast; *And who loveth danger doth perish in it.* Whence it is manifest, that that is now become hurtful and prejudicial to this young man, which considered in it self is very honest and honorable; for *it is better to marry then to burn.*

Hence we may certainly conclude, that such mens doctrine, as doe affirm that a *promise* freely and rightly given to Infidels and Hereticks, may be lawfully violated and broken, is most wicked, contrary to the law of reasonable nature, and destructive to the whole fabrick of nature, in relation to humane society. As though, forsooth, the *common lawes* of nature were not altogether the same, and altogether *indispensable* in regard of all men whosoever: Or that it were lawfull
for

for any man to defraud the professors of a different Religion from his, and to deceive and circumvent them; and yet, that it shall not be lawfull to doe the like to those who are of the same profession in Religion with himself.

All these things are most constantly settled by the law of nature, and are commanded to be observed by all Christians in the Evangelical Law after a more perfect manner. For Christ *came not to dissolve the law of nature, but to fulfill it, Mat. 5. And whosoever* (saith the Apostle, *Rom. 2.) have sinned without the Law, shall perish without the Law, &c.* And afterwards: *For since the Gentils, who have not the Law, doe naturally doe those things which belong to the Law, not having a Law, they are a Law to themselves, who doe shew the work of the Law to be written in their hearts; their conscience bearing witness unto them, &c.* And again *Rom. 3. Doe we therefore destroy the Law by faith? God forbid, but we establish the Law.* And again, *Gal. 3. Is therefore the Law against the promises of God? God forbid.* Yea, the grace of Christ doth so perfect this law of nature, as that by him we are both obliged and enabled to fulfil this law, after a more divine manner. This is the general doctrine of all Catholicks, which the Council of Trent hath rightly declared, *Seff. 6. c. 10.* in these words: *Whosoever shall say, &c. or that the ten Commandements do not belong to Christians, let him be anathematized.*

All these laws are of a greater and more perfect obligation in our Christian and Evangelical law, then in the law of nature.

A D D I T I O N S.

I Thought it not amisse to annex unto this Catholick Doctrine of keeping our words and promises given to whomsoever, whether a Christian or Infidel (which is grounded both upon divine and human Law) the following Corollarium, or Super-addition. That all Innovators and Schismaticks may know (who to magnifie their own vain conceits, and imaginarie impertinencies, doe calumniate the Catholick Religion with most false reproaches, and never cease endeavoring to defile our purest doctrine with filthy and scurrilous derisions) that they may know, I say, that all Catholicks living under the Government of Hereticall and Schismaticall Princes, or Common-wealths, are obliged by the sacred bond of Conscience and Religion, to obey their Magistrates, and are all of them most readie to perform their dutie in all civil affairs whatsoever.

Corollarium,

OR

A SUPER-ADDITION.

Of Man constituted and living in Society.

Hitherto we have briefly Treated of Mans Duty whereto he is bound by the pure law of Nature, towards God, towards himself, and towards his Neighbour, even before we suppose him stated, or entered into any society by bargain, contract, covenant, or the like. Now we will briefly speak of his duty, whereunto he is obliged by the Lawes of a reasonable creature, as he is constituted, and engaged in a Community.

There be three things which are manifest, both out of what we have said already, and out of the principles known by the light of nature. The first is, That the *Common good* (all circumstances concurring alike) is to be preferred before a *particular good*. The second is, That man hath a natural inclination and propension to enter into society, and to live in mutual peace one with another. The third is, That men are obliged to keep all the lawes, conditions and covenants, whereunto they do freely, lawfully and mutually engage themselves:

Three things
necessary to be
established.

Y y

The

1. That a common good is to be preferred before a particular good.

The first is evident, because there is more of *good*, or a greater *good* (speaking of things as in themselves) in a common, or publick *good*, then in a particular good. And being that the quality of *good*, is that which maketh a man desire any thing, the more *good* there is any thing, the more it is desirable. Whence we see is every *body*, whether it be a natural or political *body*, the particular *good* of every singular member, doth yeild and give way to the common *good*, of the whole *body*. And this must more necessarily happen where there is an intellectuall Agent, who hath a care of the whole *body*. But if you would suppose, that there is no unity in the whole masse, nor in the common good (which is as much as to suppose, that there is no *whole*, nor no common good, but a confused heap, or company of many) then truly there would be no obligation in any particular to suffer itself to perish for the safety of the whole, or for the good of the publick. But we now suppose and treat of a *body*, wherein there is an unity of the whole and common *good* to be looked unto, and preserved yet, how every particular member in this manner inserted as a part of such a *body*, is obliged to desert its own interest, for the conversation of the whole, so as to suffer itself to perish for the wholes sake, is not for me to determine at the present however it cannot be denied that a particular member of an humane society may, if he will, suffer death for his country, that is for the preservation of the whole community or society, to wit, in hope of obtaining thereby a greater felicity in a future and eternal life.

In

In the mean time it is to be noted, that God is the common and finall good of man, whom we are bound to look upon, as deserving to be beloved with a supream and unparaelled love, so as that as nothing is to be preferred, or compared unto him.

God is, as it were, the common and final good of man.

Secondly, it is to be noted, that man hath a natural propension to society, as we said before, which is manifest both by experience, and out of what we have already said of the love which is necessarily due from every one towards his neighbour. For love is an inclination ingrafted in nature by the author of nature himself, where-with every thing doth love what is like unto itself in nature. which love in inanimate, and vegetable things, we call a *natural appetite*; in sensitive things, we call it a *sensitive appetite*; And in things endowed with reason and knowledge, we call it a *rational or intellectual appetite*. And although this *Similitude* in nature, be of its proper disposition the cause of love, yet by accident, that is, when it is against some private interest, it doth often beget hatred and enmity.

2. That man is naturally inclined to society.

By the sway and inclination of this intellectual and rational love, men are naturally carried to mutual communication one with another: And from mutual communication groweth friendship in what subject soever this commerce or communication is made, whether in things honourable, profitable, or delightful. Now it falls out sometimes,, and too too often indeed, that this love, or true friendship, through the abuse of reason, doth degenerate into into self-love, which

From this inclination followeth communication, and from communication friendship.

is a love of concupiscence. But it is manifest, that this must needs happen against the natural inclination of a reasonable creature. For mans natural propension, according to the right rule of reason, is to wish his friend to *be*, to *live*, to desire his *good*, to doe him any *good*, and to converse delightfully with him. Wherefore the Apostle doth tell his dear *Timothy*, that there should come men who would sinne even against nature it self; amongst whose crimes of this nature, he specifies these; *Loving themselves, ungrateful, without love, without peace, without benig-*

2 Tim. 3.

Man's necessity of entering into society.

Further, the natural state and condition of man doth confirm this truth, who without mutual helping of each other, and uniting the forces of many in one Society, could not in any wise subsist; much lesse live with convenience.

3. Men are obliged to keep their pacts and covenants, the ground of all society.

Thirdly, it is to be noted, that men are obliged to keep their bargaines and covenants, as above, that is, all men are obliged by the most strong bond of nature to keep their words and promises. Whence doth arise the obligation of a dutiful obedience from the subject to the Superior. But that we may discern the true and lawful authority of the Superior power in every Society, we are to suppose first,

Men are born naturally rational and free.

That men are naturally *free* and *rational*; And therefore to the end they may rightly enter into Society, it is necessary that they doe it with *liberty*, and with *reason*. For being that no man by the sole constitution of nature, is another mans

mans lawful Superiour (although he may be far stronger) he who by force and violence shall sub-
ject others unto him in despight of them, doth
certainly wrong them. Wherefore every Society
ought to take its beginning from the free consent
of all those who will enter into it.

Further also, since that we suppose men to be
reasonable creatures, we must likewise suppose,
that the nature and condition of this Society or
Community which is to be instituted, doth tend &
aym at the general good and commodity of eve-
ry member of it. For it cannot be imagined by
any sensible man, that a multitude of men en-
dowed with common sense and reason, should
freely enter into society, unlesse they foresaw it
were like to prove for their good ; much lesse
would they doe it, if they foresaw that thence
their ruine and destruction would certainly fol-
low. Wherein, though some few perhaps, and
those of the weaker sort, might be deceived ; yet
if we suppose this danger to be evident, it is im-
possible that all of them should be so blind, or ra-
ther so mad, as that they would willingly preci-
pitate themselves into the misery and calamity of
a perpetual servitude and slavery.

Wherefore, it is most certain and undoubted,
that all the true power of a just superiority, takes
its rise and beginning from a part or covenant,
that is, from the free consent of many into the
choise of some supream authority, which is to
administer and have a care of the good of the
whole body. The natural rules and limits of
this power we shall determine by and by ; in

The first be-
ginning of su-
periority.

the

the mean time we are to enquire what is *mans* good.

The good of man is three-fold.

Every one, who hath enquired into the nature of man, knoweth that *mans* good, in relation to its subject, is of three sorts. The *goods* of the mind, the *goods* of the body, and the *goods* of fortune. Of these, the moral Philosophers discuss many questions, which doe no way belong to our purpose. As of the gifts and vertues of the mind; of the disposition and health of the body; and of the several kinds of the *goods* of fortune, and many other such like things. But we look upon this distinction of the *goods* of man in another sense, and after another consideration.

The good of the mind or soul.

For the first branch of this Division, which is of the *goods* of the mind or soul, we look upon them only in that consideration, as they are a necessary way or means for the attaining unto eternal salvation.

The good of the body.

For the second branch of the Division, which is, of the *goods* of the body, we consider them onely as they are necessary to our present life and liberty, and to all things requisite thereunto.

The goods of fortune.

For the third branch of the Division, which is, of the *goods* of fortune, we consider them onely in as much as men (in the state they are now in) have a true propriety in them, that is, are truly Lords and Masters, each one of his peculiar temporal estate.

The end of all civil lawes.

These things are the chief ground, and final end of all humane Lawes; upon these are built, and

to these doe tend the commandements of all Superiours. For whatsoever is ordained and decreed by the Supreme Magistrate in any Civil Commonwealth, doth certainly aym (though not immediately) to procure the subjects eternal salvation, or (immediately) to protect their lives and liberties in all occasions of danger, or to conserve every one his own in peace and quietnesse.

Now as we have already said, that all authority and superiour power doth take its beginning from a free and rational pact or covenant, whereby all subjects are bound by the Law of nature, to yield obedience to the Supreme Authority: So may we adde, that it is also a *divine precept*, to wit, that every subject ought to give all due obedience to the established civil Authority, of what profession in Religion soever it be. Whosoever therefore doth withstand and resist a superior authority lawfully constituted and justly governing, doth offend against the law of nature (which doth teach us, that every one ought to stand to his bargain or covenant) and against the Law of God, which doth command obedience to every subject: *Let every soul be subject to higher powers*, saith the Apostle, *Rom. 13.* And in the same place: *He that doth resist power, doth resist Gods Ordinance: And those that do resist, do procure their own damnation.* And afterwards; *Be therefore subject out of necessity, not only for fear of anger, but for conscience sake.* And *Tit. 3. Admonish them to be subject to powers and Princes, to obey their words,* &c. And *1 Pet. 2. Be subject to every humane crea-*

Obedience is due to the civil Magistrate by divine right.

ture

ture for Gods sake, whether it be to a King, as to the head, or to Dukes, as sent by him, &c. for so is the will of God. And again in the same place: Honour Kings; servants be subject to your Master, not onely to good and vertuous ones, but even to bad ones. And Prov. 8. *By me Kings reign and govern.* And the like is to be found commonly in many other places of the holy Scriptures. So that we may put this as an undoubted and acknowledged truth by every man who hath the use of reason, and is endued with Christian faith.

Additions.

What followeth was written against some of our famous English Protestants, who have ever laboured to make the world believe, that our Catholick Priests, who have been put to death for their Priesthood, were traitors to the King and State. And this Assertion they build chiefly upon this ground, That if it were lawful for any subject to refuse obedience, nay or to examine and discuss the law and command of the supreme power, whatsoever this law or commandment should be, or what matter soever it might concerne, divine or humane; If this, say they, were lawful, the main foundation of all publick tranquillity and peaceable government would be quite overthrowen and subverted. To confound this vain and unchristian Opinion, I was forced to propound these following suppositions, which doe no way touch any supreme power in particular, at least amongst Christian States and Princes.

Never-

Neverthelesse, certain it is, that all power upon earth hath its rules and limits. Nor did I ever hear any wise man doubt of it. For who but a mad man will deny, that all power of governing and administring the publick good is given (from whomsoever it is given, and which the Apostle saith, *he received from the Lord, 2 Cor. 13. to edification, and not to destruction.*

All created power hath its limits.

The first thing therefore that is to be noted and supposed, is, That those in whose hands the supreme power of every Society or Commonwealth is placed, and who have the reines of Government in their hands, are *Men (who when they were born did breath the common aire, and did fall down likewise upon the same ground, and weeping breathed forth their first voice like unto other men; for no King ever had any other beginning, Sap. 7.)* liable to sinnes and errours; yea, and that which sometimes happeneth, may possibly fall into all impiety and wickedness. It is possible, that such men may exercise a most violent tyranny and cruel domination of their subjects. That they may break all contracts and covenants freely and justly made with their vassals. That they may command wicked things, and even crimes of treason against God; yea, and ordain things, to the ruine of the fortunes, lives, and liberties of their subjects. And finally, that there are no such horrid blasphemies and execrations, but may fall within their commands. And I never saw any wise man, nor shall, I believe, easily finde any, that will be so impudent as to say, that the subjects of such a supreme authority, were bound to

Every Magistrate is liable to error and sin.

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

Most wicked
but possible
commande-
ments suppo-
sed.

obey these commandements. Let us suppose that the Supreme Authority puts forth an Edict, whereby he commands his subjects to blaspheme and curse God; To adore an Idol, or his own Statua for God (as did *Nabuchodonosor*, *Dan. 3.*) To throw their Divine Law, or as we Christians may say, all the copies of the Old and New Testament, into the fire; To be Witches or Inchanters; To kill themselves; To be proud, luxurious, drunkards, gluttons; To kill their parents, or their neighbours; To commit rape, incest, adultery, sodomy, and the like; to defame each other with false backbiting, injurious crimes, and calumnies; And lastly, to take from each other by force or fraud, their peculiar and proper goods and fortunes, saying; *So I will have it, so I command you.* Are we to obey these precepts?

The flatterers
of these times.

Truly I should have been ashamed to have proposed or called to mind such things as these, but that we see some sycophants and inventers of new opinions, who in these our dayes doe so basely flatter all supreme power, which doe administer the publick affaires of Commonwealths, as that they are not ashamed to say, we ought to look upon them as free from all sin and error; yea, to be worshipped and adored as Gods.

The first
bound or li-
mit of all crea-
ted power.

Be it therefore a constant limit, and an immoveable rule, appointed to all created power whatsoever, by the eternal and supreme Dominion of their Creator, that nothing clearly and evidently contrary to the Divine Ordinances of God, or to the lawes and rights of nature, can be imposed by any created power or authority upon its subjects.

jects. For whatsoever is a meanes absolutely necessary for attaining unto eternal salvation (whether it be in regard of some good that is to be prosecuted, or of some evil that is to be eschewed) it is beyond all power upon earth to hinder any man lawfully from the free and just embracing and profession of it. This we have learned of the Apostles, who said, *Acts 5. We must rather obey God then men.* Wherefore, if we suppose any Commonwealth or Kingdome endued with Christian Religion, and whereof the universal belief is, that this Religion onely doth contain the true method and manner of Divine worship, and that this is the onely way to eternal salvation; supposing that in this case the supreme power would by force and violence extinguish this Belief and Religion, and would bring in its place, and establish the law of the *Jewes* or *Turks*, or of any other prophane worship or Idolatry; It is most certain that the subjects of this Authority are neither bound, nor ought to obey such commands.

We may yet streighten the limits of supreme power. There is no man but knows this truth, *That the safety of the people, is the Supreme Law.* If therefore at any time, the supreme power would either directly or indirectly, when and how he pleaseth, without all form of Law or Justice, set upon his subjects lives, and would kill them, or cause them to be killed in the streets for recreation sake; or would ordain any thing which would manifestly and necessarily bring the Commonwealth or Kingdome to ruine (as to forbid

The second bound or limit of all created power.

all agriculture, all traffique, or the like) it is as evident, as in the former case, that the subjects of such a supreme power were not bound to obey it in these commands.

The third limit of all civil power.

Yea, we may yet further restrain and limit the power of supreme Authority. There be three things which doe so nearly belong to the state and condition of every Commonwealth and Society, as that, if any thing opposite unto any of them, should be universally and generally practised, the very essence of such a society, could not stand or be preserved. 1. The temporal good of the whole Community. 2. The natural liberty of the subject. And 3. The peculiar propriety which every particular member of the Commonwealth hath over such things as are not to others, nor doe belong to any but himself. All civil power is ordained for the maintenance or manutention of these three things: It was first given and settled amongst men for the preservation of these three principles, which are indeed the scope and end of all civil Authority. Now, if any publick or rational Agent, shall generally in all his actions, wittingly and willingly erre in the administration of his office from the principal end, for which he is chiefly ordained; clear it is, that he presently looseth the obedience which is justly due unto his function, and consequently looseth the power of commanding. Whensoever therefore the supreme power doth command any thing which is a manifest destruction and subversion of the publick good, and of the whole Commonwealth (the preservation whereof is the only

only motive of making Societies) or which doth quite take away the natural liberty of the subject (that is, whereby the subject would be generally brought, without any cause, into slavery and captivity) or whereby every particular mans peculiar estate and fortune (to wit, that which every one, either by his own industry, or by some other just title, had appropriated unto himselfe) should be generally taken from him, without any form of law; insomuch, that all the subjects under the command of this supreme power, should have their goods taken from them against their wills, without any necessity of the common good of the Society; It is no lesse evident then before, that in these cases, such subjects were not bound to obey these commands.

Finally, since that every Society did take its first birth and beginning from some covenants and agreements made betwixt the people and the supreme power; And that the lawes and rules of every government and discipline thus mutually transacted and settled, are the ground, the form, and the life of every Community; It is manifest, that if the supreme authority would generally command things contrary to these laws, and would openly professe, that he would erect a voluntary or arbitrary government, and should say, *My will shall stand for reason*, that is, would not at least pretend, that neither reason, nor justice, nor even law, should be the measure of his goverment: Such subjects were immediately free from the obligation of obedience to such commands.

A D D I T I O N S.

Having heard that these common suppositions which I had put against some particular Schismatics of these times, did displease divers Catholicks, (a thing far from my intention) I thought it not amiss to clear my innocence by a more ample explication of my minde, in this second Edition.

I did, and do still acknowledge, and maintain, that the Authority of the Supreme power, in every civil or political Society, is truly and without controule *supreme*, which I have already shewed to be so established by *Divine, natural, and political right*, that it is altogether *indissolvable*, subject to none upon earth in its kind, dependent of God only and immediately. And therefore, *be that doth resist unto power and authority, doth resist Gods Ordinance*. Yet, is all power and authority grounded in reason; and therefore we must needs acknowledge, that the exercise of it ought to be conformable to reason, since it doth flow from, and take its being from God (who is reason it self) as from its first root and fountain.

There resides therefore by the *order of God*, and *right of nature*, in every humane society, a power to govern it self, and to administer its affaires, to the common and publick good. Which whether it be in one or in many, it is from God himselfe. And when this power is in one, it is Regal, and *indissolvable* by any created authority, either Ecclesiastical

clesiastical or civil. And therefore the *obedience* due unto it, is altogether *indispensable*; In somuch that neither a general Council, nor the Pope, (which we have elsewhere shewed) can depose and exauthorize (if we take these words in their proper sense) those who are once settled in possession of this supreme authority.

But if we suppose (as many Divines do put the question) that this supream power doth make an unjust law, whereby the sacred worship of Religion, and divine faith, is like to be overthrown; The nature of such a fact may be declared publicly by a General Council, or by the Pope; That it is a crime of treason against God himself; for the judgment of such cases belongeth to the Church. But to proceed further, [and to involve itself in such secular businesses] the Church never had any such command from God.

All the world knows, that this indissolveable and sacred authority, doth belong to our most Christian King, the eldest Son of the Church, by a special right. Who doth not only possesse his Empire upon all such rights and titles, as other Sovereigne Princes do, but hath also divers most just and special priviledges, upon which his supream Dominion is particularly established, and which never ought to be violated. Yea this sacred authority of our Kings of *France*, hath been many times even miraculously supported and protected by Gods special providence, when humane wisdom hath been wanting. So that it were a crime to beleive that it ever was or is lawful for any particular person, of what condition

or

or quality soever, to cause insurrections against our Kings, or to rebel against them in any manner whatsoever; yea, or that any rebel ever had a just cause of his rebellion. For it were absurd for any man to think, that it is lawful for any single man to deduce and apply these common and general suppositions to a particular case or fact.

This doctrine supposed, I did not think any Catholick could have doubted of the truth in this question, as I stated it. I confesse, I knew there were and are certain hereticks (for I had heard it often said with mine own ears, and seen it lately in print with mine own eyes) who dare say that there is no possible case, nor that there can be any imagined, wherein we are not obliged to obey the will of the supream power. Inasmuch, that though we should suppose, the supream power of the Kingdome, or Common-wealth, to command anything manifestly opposite to the law of God, of nature, and of nations, yet were his subjects obliged to obey him herein.

But these prophane men, do neither certainly in their hearts believe that there is a God, nor that the rational soul of man is immortal; And therefore place not the supream good of man, in a future eternal felicity, but in the preservation of civil societies: nor contrary wise, the greatest evil of man, in the pains of eternal punishment, but in sedition and discord of people and subjects against their Sovereigns. And they imagine that this union and peace in civil societies, cannot be securely preserved, unlesse we grant that we must
 ever

ever and every where obey the will of the fupream power, whether juft, lawful, and reafonable, or unjuft, facriligious, and impious, in what caufe foever can happen, or can be imagined.

Thefe men whilft they feem to extoll the fupream power to the topp of all authority, they give the fubjects great occafion (if I miftake not) of revolt and rebellion. It was never heard, that any fupream power did profefse he would or could ordain, and proclaim what ever he pleafed againft all Divine and humane laws. That he would or could command any thing at his pleafure, without having any reafon for it, againft the fundamental laws of the Kingdome. That he would or could enjoin his fubjects to do any thing againft manifelt juftice, and evident reafon. Nor that he did profefse to acknowledge any other rule, or limit of his power, then only his will though never fo unjuft, fo unlawful, and fo unreafonable, faying: *I will have it fo, I command it fo, my will fhall ftand for reafon.* Thefe tenets I fay were never heard to be pretended, nor ought they ever to be propofed or alleaged, unleffe it be to confound fome heretick or fchifmatick. And certainly, nowife man can doubt, but if that at any time the condition of publick affaires do force the fupream power to impofe harder burdens, and greater taxes upon the fubjects, then they are willing to undergoe, yet is this ftill to be fupposed reafonable, fince that the fupream authority doth ever declare, that this is done out of neceffity, which of all reafons is the

and strongest. Being therefore we suppose this supream power is to govern reasonable creatures; we must likewise necessarily suppose, that it ought to govern them, according to the rules of justice and reason.

Nor did I believe that any Catholick could think, that subjects were obliged to obey such commandements as we supposed to be against the laws of *God, of nature, of justice, of reason*. Nay, he that should say, this is the opinion and mind of Kings and Princes; I mean, that all this is lawful and uncontrollable in them, & should blase and report this amongst the people, might be rightly suspected to be a *Traitor*; that is, one who would provoke the subjects to sedition, and rebellion.

This all people discontented with the present government have ever pretended, as the chief cause of their revolt; which, when once they can instil it into the peoples ears with rumors, though never so false, And then with tumultuous clamors make it sound all the Kingdome over, it is no small argument of eminent danger to the supream power.

This our English Protestant Schismaticks to whom it is said (these general suppositions were displeasing, which I much admire) have lately and unfortunately experienced. And this chiefly, because they could not make the people believe that the state had no intention to bring in any thing contrary to these general suppositions. Every man knows how often King *Charles* the first, did protest in publick Parliament, & divulge in words
and

and writing, that he would never go about to innovate any thing against the Divine law, or Religion then established, nor against the fundamental lawes of the Kingdome, nor against the true liberty, or propriety of the subject; nor in fine, against the antient rights and priviledges of Parliament. But his adversaries on the contrary *cryed louder then he, and their votes prevailed.*

I wondred therefore that our English Schismatics, who are on the Kings party, could take amisse what I proposed in common suppositions, with a sincere intention, looking only upon the truth in general. For I did conceive, it was not the Kings interest to challenge that as due unto him, the opposite whereof did chiefly seem to clear his fathers innocency, yea and which his adversaries have ever published as the principle cause of their revolt. But I much more wondred at it, when I called to mind the seditious writings and tumultuous factions, which the Ringleaders of their and the like schismes have both written and practised against several supream, and regal authorities. All men of reading and learning know, the seditious and pernicious maximes, yea the cruel and bloody rebellions, which *Luther, Melancthon, Bucerus, Ofsander, Calvin, Zuinglus, Beza, Knox, Bucaman,* and others of the same stamp have written and rayseed against the sacred persons of Kings and supream authority; whereof many are related in a small treatise called *Monarchomachia*, wherein is shewed, that hereticks are generally enemies to Kings.

Yet were it absurd to say, that the supream

power is obliged to give an account of his commands to his subjects ; for that cannot be alwaies done. But as on the one side we must say, that obedience is not to be given to a command which we suppose to be irreligious, unjust, and irrational so on the other side, the Cominandements of superiours, are to be supposed and esteemed, just, lawful and rational.

Wherefore, this my supposition is the opinion of all Catholick Divines, with *S. Thomas of Aquin*, in his little work, *Of the Government of a Prince* : for *All power is given for edification, and not for destruction.* 2 Cor. 13. *It is by me that Kings rule, and that law makers do ordain just things.* Prov. 8. This Doctrine I say, all the Catholick authors that ever I saw, do professe; And they constitute the nature and essence of a law in this, That it is the rational will of a supream power.

Nor doth it belong to the subject (as we said l. 2. c. 9 leſt 2.) to withstand and oppose their superiour commands, when they please. And again, l. 2. c. 3. S. 2. *It doth not belong to the subject to call into question the decrees of their supream tribunal or authority ; nor to correct, when they shall think fit, the lawes established by authority, which is the proper nature of tumult and sedition, &c.* Nor is it to be replied, that all humane power may swarve from the right rule of truth and reason ; whereof we gave a sufficient reason in the place cited even now, in these words : *As though we ought not to obey the sentence of the supream Judge of the common wealth because the Judge is not free, by divine right, from all possibility of error.*

Although it be manifest, out of what we have said, that it is in the hand of the supream authority to dissolve any law whatsoever established by any civil power, in a singular case of necessity: yet is it the greatest glory, and security of Kings, to govern all things sweetly and strongly, according to the general lawes of the Kingdome, and *fundamental* statutes of the Common-wealth.

Whereas I said, that in all civil societies, the supream power, whether it be in one, or in many did take its first beginning from some Covenant betwixt it and the people, after the example of King David; *who did make a covenant with the Elders of Jsrael in Hebron before the Lord.* 2 Reg.c. 5 I did not foresee that it would be an occasion of scandal to any, for when I looked back upon the beginnings of all Kingdoms & Commonwealths; when I read over the histories which relate unto us, the waies and means by which every supream power did first establish its empire; when I found that in every Kingdome and Common-wealth, there were certain lawes, which were the special ground works, and pillars of the common-wealth, and therefore called *fundamental*; and lastly, when I considered that all soveraign Princes did oblige themselves by a solemn oath, either at their unction, or coronation, to keep and observe these Divine and humane lawes; I did not hesitate, no more then many other Divines had done before me, to assert this proposition in general, which doth nothing prejudice any supream power in particular, that doth pretend, or hath in effect any special priviledge of this King, if there
be

The Analysis of Divine Faith.

be any such. For this we see hath been done even in those Kingdomes which have been first got by warrs. To wit, that the conqueror hath covenanted with the people, and transacted with them upon certain conditions, whereby all things might be directed and governed under him in peace and quietnesse.

I have likewise heard that others have taken scandal from these general suppositions, because there can be found no Judge of the cases we propose. But these men certainly do not consider the state of the question, nor of their own difficulty. For the suppositions we have put, are only in general and in common, and do not designe any particular state of things. Further there is no need of a Judge, where we suppose the thing to be determined on the own side. For we do not enquire, whether the commandement of the supream power, whereof we speak, be opposite to the lawes of God and nature; whether it be contrary to Justice and reason, and destructive of the publick good; but supposing for certain that it be so, whether such a commandement ought to be obeyed or no. Wherefore, these mens objections, and difficulties, are of no value, being the question is not of the *thesis* or position, but of the *Hypothesis*, or in supposition of such a case, what is true. Further it is never lawful to appeale from a particular commandement of a soveraigne superiour, to any other Judge; for the office of a Judge is to be performed in those things only which a mongst particular and prudent men seem to be doubtful and uncertain. But in doubtful

ful things betwixt a sovereign Superiour and a subject, it is never lawful for the subject to refuse *obedience to the commands* of his Sovereign. And the reason is, because the *injustice* and the *iniquity* of the commandement of a Sovereign, must be as evident and manifest, to the end that it may be lawful for the subject to disobey, as is the truth of the first principles of nature; for example, *That the whole is bigger then any part of it*, for who otherwise doth withstand power, doth withstand Gods Ordinance.

I forbore expressly to touch several questions which Divines doe handle in this matter, lest I should produce somthing that might be ungrateful to any publick Minister of State. I would not as much as alledge the opinions of Divines upon this subject; for it neither was to my purpose, nor is it my profession to meddle in such busineses. It was sufficient for me to make it appear evidently, that the Catholicks of *England, Scotland, and Ireland*, who have ever been most obedient to their Soveraignes, even since those Nations have been Schismaticks in all civil and political busineses, are not bound to observe and obey the lawes and statutes, though made by the supreme power of those Nations against the Catholick Faith and Religion, no more then were the Christians of the primitive Church, to obey the Edicts of the Roman Emperors against Christianity. Yea, and that these Catholicks cannot in conscience obey any such commands, that is, abjure the Catholick faith, and Christian society, and make themselves partakers of schism and heresie,

refie, wherein those Nations have been unfortunately involved these many years.

This truth ought to be common to all men of what profession in Religion soever they be, that is, no man ought, upon any motive whatsoever, renounce his Religion, as long as he is of opinion that it is a good and true one. These Catholicks therefore ought rather to suffer death (though a most cruel and barbarous one) following the example of their Predecessors, then desert their faith and Religion. For although the authority of the supreme power did enact these laws, yet being they certainly perswade themselves, that they are contrary to the lawes of God, they may rightly judge, that *God must be rather obeyed then men.* And to such as shall calumniate them, they may give that religious answer which the Apostle hath taught them: *Judge your selves whether it be just in the sight of God, that we should rather bear you then God.*

Acts 5.

Subjects may as well withstand as disobey their Superiours commanding unjust things.

What hath been hitherto said of obeying, may be transferred to opposing; since that for the reason, for which subjects are lawfully freed from their obedience; they may, I say, with the same right, oppose and withstand the commanding power. For if the Sovereign doe exceed the known bounds and limits of his authority, and will offer violence to his subjects, force and compell them to all impieties, contrary to the laws of God and nature, it is evident, that it is lawful for such subjects by the right of nature to defend themselves by what means soever they can,
yea,

yea, and in some occasions and some circumstances, they may be obliged to it.

Additions.

This opinion Cardinal *Peron* doth amply and elegantly maintain, and doth demonstrate the truth of it, in the speech which he made to this purpose, to the popular State of *France* (which is called of the third order) in the general Assembly of the States of the Kingdome, in the year 1613: where he doth affirm, that Soverign Princes and Kings, in the suppositions and cases which we have put, *doe fall from all dignity and right of government.* Which in his opinion ought to be declared by a General Council, or by the Pope, who should likewise denounce unto such subjects, that they are absolved and freed from all obedience. Which after he hath proved at large with many arguments taken from authority, examples, and reason, at length he saith, those who have written to the contrary in favour of the oath of Allegiance in *England*; *N'ont iamais peuten trouver en toute la France, depuis que les Escholes de Theologie y ont esté instituees iusques a nos jours, un seul Docteur, ny Theologien ny Jurisconsult, un seul decret, un seul Concil, un seul Arrest de Parlement, un seul Magistrat, ny Ecclesiastique ny Politique qui ayt dit qu'en cas d'heresie ou d'infidelité les sujets ne puissent estre absous du serment de fidelité, qu'ils doiuent a leur Prince. Au contraire, &c.* That is to say. *They could never find in all France* (which out of *France* he had already shewed was never heard of) *since the Schools*

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

of Divinity have been instituted until this day, any one Doctor, either Divine or Lawyer, any Decree, any Council, any sentence of Parliament, any one Magistrate either Ecclesiastical or Civil, who hath said, that in case of heresie or infidelity (which is much lesse then what I proposed) their subjects might not be absolved from the oath of fidelity which they owe to their Prince: Nay contrariwise, &c. And afterwards, when he comes to solve the great difficulty, to wit, that obedience due to the Supreme Authority, is of Divine right: And having alledged those very places of the holy Scriptures in confirmation hereof, which I have cited above, he saith thus: *Et de la inferrent que l'obéissance au Roys, est de droit divin, et donc ne peut recevoir dispense par aucune autorité ny spirituelle ny temporelle. Les défenseurs de la partie affirmative respondent a l'oposte, que ces passages ne touchent en aucune sorte le vœu de la controverse. Car la question, disent ils, n'est pas sil est de droit divin d'obeïr au Roys; mais la question est, sil est de droit divin, que celuy qui a esté une fois reconnu pour Roy par le corps de l'estat, ne puisse cesser de l'estre, Cest a dire quil ne puisse commettre chose pour laquelle il luy arrive de dechoir de ses droits et cesser d'estre reconnu pour Roy. Or ce sont deux questions bien differentes, &c. That is to say: And thence infer (to wit, those who maintain as I do, in vertue of the places of Scripture cited above, that this obedience is due by divine right) that obedience due to Kings is of divine right, and therefore indispensable by any authority, either spiritual or temporal. The defenders of the affirmative part doe answer, that these places doe no way touch the point of the*

the controversie. For the question is not, say they whether obedience to Kings be due by divine right; but the question is, whether it be of divine right, that he who is once acknowledged for King by the body of the publick State, may not cease to be King, that is, may not doe that by which it doth happen to him, to fall from all his rights, and cease to be reputed as King. Now these two questions are farre differrent, &c.

But I will not alledge the opinions of several Divines in this point; for I intend not to make an Apology. It is sufficient for me to have shewed, that all Catholicks living under the Government, either of Hereticks or Infidels, are obliged *even in conscience*, to be faithful and obedient to their Sovereign in all civil Affaires. Although they are likewise bound to be ready rather to die, then to violate their Divine Faith and Religion in obeying them; which was my sole and onely design in this *Corollarium*, or Super-addition. For I professe, I doe so much honour and reverence all Supreme Authority, that I doe not think there is any true Christian doth respect them more then my self. And truly, had I proposed any thing that might have been prejudicious in the leastwise to the sacred power of Kings, I should have most willingly recalled it, as impertinent and unworthy of my profession.

I have likewise heard, that there have been some who have muttered and murmured, as though I had proposed something injurious to, or derogating from the Popes Authority. It is strange and prodigious to see whither men are carried

The Analasys of Divine Faith.

by passion and faction: What does not immoderate and partial men finde fault with? It is known to the Christian world, that tis and hath been this long time, the Doctrine of our famous School of Paris, *That the Pope out of a Councel is not infallible in his definitions and decisions of questions; especially if they be speculative, not even decreeing out of his chaire, as they call it.* This opinion I onely proposed as no heresie, nor consequently the opposite Tenet, to be an Article of faith. And therefore, that an Heretick or Schismatick may be admitted into the Church, although he professe, that he will not be obliged to hold, either the one or the other side, as an Article of Faith: which was the onely designe of this Book in every particular Article.

I did not believe that any man would have taken this amisse, though I knew there were some late Divines who hold, and too too boldly affirm, that this Doctrine of our School, is neer unto heresie, because it doth seem to them, that the opposite opinion doth immediately follow out of the principles of faith. But I did, and doe still most certainly believe, that the opinion of these Divines, grounded only upon their own ratiocination, cannot make it passe throughout the universal Church, for an Article of our revealed and Catholick faith.

All other Divine rights and priviledges of the Pope, which the whole Church doth acknowledge, I did establish. But to condemn of heresie in this point, the ancient Fathers of our School
(who

(who deserve veneration from all posterity) as *Gerson, Almainus*, and many others; As also very many of the learned and later Doctors of our faculty; yea, and to censure this their doctrine as heretical, I neither could nor ought to have done it.

I did think I had sufficiently prevented the over-froward censuring humour of some passionate men, by a clause which I inserted on purpose into the Preface of this Book. And if I had desired (after the manner of our late writers) to have rather made a bulkiſh volume then a pocket book, I would have cited, in all such points as I could imagine might be ungrateful, either to the captious or ignorant, the names, places, and words of divers most learned, and most Catholick Authors, who do maintain as true, those Tenets, whose opposite I onely say, are no Articles of faith.

If what I have said doe so displease any Catholick, as that he have a mind to write against me, let him know that I am resolved never to write against any Catholick Author. Yea, and that it is forbidden me to reply to whatever any such man may say or write against me. I only looked upon the Adversaries of the Catholick Church, when I made this small Treatise; whereat, if any of them be offended, and shall provoke me with his pen, let him know that I stand ready to defend, to the utmost of my power, this our Christian faith, and these our Catholick truths.

There

Who is to be
judge be-
twixt the Ma-
gistrate and
the Subject.

There is yet one point to be considered, which is, Although these things be true in their common *hypothesis* or suppositions, yet who shall be appointed Judge betwixt the people and the Emperour in a particular case which may occur. To which question, though some conceive it very hard to answer, yet out of what we have said, an answer doth clearly follow. For since the obedience of the subject to superior powers, is evidently and indispensably due by *Divine, natural, and humane right*. It must appear at least as evidently to all men, not engaged in faction, that the cause of their withdrawing themselves from their obedience, is most just and lawfull: Wherefore, *common sense*, and reason of all free and dis-interested men, is the only Judge.

I doe willingly omit to speak of what is to be said in case of some extraordinary defectuosity in him to whom this supreme power may belong. As if he who ought to have the administration of the common good, were wholly unfit for it through some essential defect in nature. For example, in a Monarchy, whether Elective, or by Succession, it should fall out, that the Heir of the Kingdom were a natural Idiot, mad, stupid, senseless, or had any other such like disposition, whereby he were altogether incapable of governing. Who shall judge of the degree of his incapacity? and whether he be fit to undertake this charge, or no? Shall it be the Princes of the Kingdom? The Lords and Barons of the Land? The house of *Paris*? The supreme Court of Parliament? Let the flatterers of supreme powers

powers see what they are to answer to these questions.

This I thought fit to shew briefly upon occasion concerning the indispensable obedience of the subject to the civil Magistrate, of what profession or practise in Religion soever he be: Which, as all the rest contained in this Book, I willingly submit to the judgment of the learned, and much more to the wills of my Superiors.

FINIS.

1871
The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been admitted to the membership of the Society since the last meeting of the Executive Committee, held on the 15th of December, 1870.

1. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
2. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
3. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
4. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
5. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
6. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
7. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
8. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
9. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
10. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
11. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
12. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
13. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
14. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
15. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
16. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
17. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
18. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
19. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
20. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
21. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
22. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
23. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
24. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
25. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
26. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
27. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
28. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
29. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
30. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
31. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
32. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
33. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
34. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
35. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
36. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
37. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
38. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
39. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
40. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
41. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
42. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
43. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
44. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
45. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
46. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
47. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
48. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
49. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
50. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
51. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
52. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
53. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
54. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
55. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
56. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
57. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
58. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
59. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
60. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
61. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
62. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
63. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
64. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
65. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
66. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
67. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
68. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
69. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
70. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
71. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
72. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
73. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
74. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
75. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
76. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
77. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
78. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
79. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
80. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
81. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
82. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
83. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
84. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
85. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
86. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
87. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
88. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
89. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
90. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
91. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
92. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
93. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
94. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
95. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
96. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
97. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
98. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
99. Mr. J. H. [illegible]
100. Mr. J. H. [illegible]

AN APPENDIX OF SCHISME.

Written by the same Author.

I beseech you brethren by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, that there be no Schism amongst you, 1 Cor. 1. 10.



Being earnestly entreated by a friend of mine, who had seen and read over the precedent Treatises, *Of the resolution of Faith*; that I would likewise adde a short discourse of the nature and qualities of *Schism*: I easily yielded unto his request (being one to whom I could not refuse any ordinary courtesie) both because of our mutual and ancient friendship; as also because he did assure me (and I make no small account of his judgment) that a work of this kind would bring no small light to such as are not of the right way in their belief and Religion, and might bring them perhaps into the fair and certain path of the Catholick Church, Whereupon, I presently framed this *Appendix*, and made it as brief and succinct as possibly I could. Where-

in I endeavour to shew the nature of *Schisme*, the several kinds of *Schisme*, and the dangerous state of those who wittingly and wilfully live, and dy in *Schisme*.

Schism destroys charity.

Lib. I. De sermone Domini in monte, cap. 5.
Rom. 13.

I must here suppose what is said in the two precedent Treatises of the nature and unity of the Church ; of the spiritual jurisdiction which Christ hath given to its Pastors and Governors ; and consequently, of the obedience and submission due unto them ; And of the tenets of hereticks and Sectaries universally and unanimously disclaimed by the Catholick Church. I now only intend to discusse the nature of *Schisme*, as it is distinguished from *heresie*, this being opposite to *faith*, that to *Charity*. First therefore we are to note, that *Charity*, being the life and spirit of a Christian soul, what *schisme* soever doth destroy and extinguish *Charity*, must likewise necessarily kill and murder the soul. Wherefore *S. Austin* shewing, that the suffering of tribulations and affliction is unprofitable, and fruitlesse to the soul, unlesse they be endured for Christ his sake *Schismaticks* can promise themselves nothing of reward, for where charity is not, there can be no justice. The love of our neighbour doth work no evil, which if they had, they would not tear a sunder the body of Christ, which is the Church.

But before I enter any further into the matter, we may note, that some Protestants (under which name, I will, in this discourse, comprehend all those who are not in actual communion with the Roman Catholick Church) conceive themselves to differ so little (though indeed nothing

can

The divers
opinions of
Protestants
touching
Schisme.

can be little which seperates a member from the body of the Church either in doctrine or communion,) from the doctrine of the Roman Catholick Church in the main and necessary points of Religion, that they imagine they may safely continue as they are, with security of salvation. Nay, we are now fallen into such variety of severall sectaries, and we find such insolence of libertine wits, that nothing, though never so evident even to common sense, but is called in question. Mens phantasies have broken down and passed over the bounds and limits of the Churches rule, government, & authority; yea, they fly into such infinite multiplicity of extravagant negatives, that there be some Protestants who deny, that to live in *Schisme* is any crime or danger of salvation; others that there is no *Schisme* at all between the Roman Catholick Church, and their Congregation. So that we are put to prove, that tis day at full noone tyde, and light in fair Sun shine. Would any man think, but that the Protestants having deserted (shortly after *Luthers* revolt) the Roman Catholick Church (whether upon just grounds or no, is not now in question) and renounced communion with her, both in doctrinal tenets of Divine faith, and religious practise of Sacrifice and Sacraments, but that there is a *Schisme* made thereby? And this by them? And from that Church with which they lived in communion before? Had I not heard this maintained to my face, I should have hardly believed it. Wherefore, I will briefly demonstrate that there is a *Schisme* betwixt the Protestants, and the Roman

What is treated in this Appendix.

Catholick Church; And that this *Schisme* is on their side, to wit, that they are the *Schismaticks*; and that to live wittingly and willingly in *Schisme* is to be in a dangerous state. Although some of the weaker sort, who not being able to judge of the erime and peril they are in, may perhaps be excused through ignorance. But first, it will be needful to know what *Schisme* is:

The first Article.

Wherein consists the nature of Schisme? And how many kinde of Schisms there be?

What is
schisme

S*chisme*, both according to the Etymology and property of the word, as also to the general and common notion of it; is nothing else, but a division or separation of some one whole body into two or more parts. But as it belongs to our purpose it is a division or separation in a Body or society of man, who make profession of one and the same Divine faith and worship in Christian Religion, though otherwise living under the government: of different Kingdomes, States and Common-wealths; *A division I say in their faith or religious profession.*

Two kinde of
schismes.

Schisme thus defined, may happen two manner of waies: first, it may be a division of two parts or members of this religious society, separating themselves from each other, both of them remaining united to the rest of the whole community. Secondly, it may be a separation of one only part or member, from all the rest of the Society.

Here

Here we are to note, that there can be no *Schisme* of the first sort in the Christian and universal Church directly concerning the expresse articles of our divine and Catholick faith, that is, whereof the one side wilfully maintained, would make an assured and evident *heresie*. For it cannot be supposed, the whole Church doth believe and teach two opposite and contrary tenets as articles of her revealed faith *essentially and necessarily* to be believed or practised by all her subjects. Wherefore all *Schismes* of this nature, that is, of two parts or members refusing communion to each other, and yet both united to the rest of the body, must needs proceed from some other subject, and upon some other occasion. As from some uncertain point of doctrine, or unnecessary practise of Divine worship, whereof neither part is universally esteemed by the Church, to be of Divine belief or institution. Or from some matter of fact either Ecclesiastical or civil, which may have begotten a passionate quarrel and vehement animosity betwixt these parties. As for example: If the Pastors and Christian people of two Diocesan, Metropolitan or national Churches, should obstinately refuse communion and participation in Sacrifice and Sacraments to each other, upon occasion of some Theological question problematically agitated in the Schools, or upon some ordinance and matter of fact Ecclesiastical or civil; and yet both parties communicate in Sacrifice and Sacraments, with all the rest of the Church, This were a heinous crime and damnable *Schisme* in them both, through
want

The first kind of the schisme cannot be in essential things.

This kind of schisme may proceed from two sorts of causes.

want of love and charity to each other though in all necessary points, and practices of Religion, they were otherwise sufficiently united to the rest of the Catholick Church,

This Kind of Schisme may be taken up by the Church

But this kind of *Schisme* doth not belong to my purpose; yet may we note by the way, that the universal Church (to whom we suppose, both these parties are united, and to whom they both profess themselves subject in vertue of this union) hath power to accord and agree them, either by determining the question in a general Council, if it be in a disputable point; or by its commands to both parties, under pain of excommunication, to reconcile themselves to each other, at least in religious communion, if their difference proceed from a matter of fact Ecclesiastical or civil.

The second sort of schism may happen in two several subjects.

The second sort of *Schisme*, to wit, of one part or member from the rest of the whole Church, is that which we are now to examine. This *Schisme*, may proceed from two causes; or rather may happen in two sorts of matters; As either in a point of Catholick doctrine, and article of faith, as in the *Arrian*; or in matter of fact of Divine institution, as in the *Donatists* and *Gre-tians*.

To what multitude or number such a *Schisme*, upon either of these occasions, may grow by little and little, as, whether it may not come to be the greater part of the whole Church; whether the Pope may not be of the *Schismatical* part, yea, and be a chief maintainer of it; How long such a *Schisme* may continue; what evil effects, and deplorable miseries it may produce both ecclesiastical

astical and civil states: These, I say, and many such like questions, I intend not to examine, being nothing to my designe; And their resolution depending of the knowledge and discussion of the factious supports of secular powers, of the divers interests of Princes and states, of particular mens pride and ambition; and of other such like Principles, as I am not willing to search into.

Yet must we note, that all *Schismes* of this nature, must needs have had their source and origine from some own partieular man, who first broke the Ice, and was the Ringleader of this seperation and revolt.

If this *Schisme*, whereof we speak, be in, or do proceed from a point of Catholick doctrine (though in itself purely speculative) which is universally maintained and taught by the whole Church as an article of faith, then this *Schisme*, doth involve *heresie*, as in the *Arrians*, denying Christs Godhead.

If it be in, or do proceed from a matter of fact of some external worship, universally taught, and practised by the Catholick Church as of Divine institution either in Sacrifice or Sacrament, then this *Schisme* doth involve *Sacrilege*.

If it be in, or do proceed from resisting or opposing the commands of a superiour power (though not in an essential matter of Religion) then it doth involve disobedience.

Here we may note, that all *Schismes*, doth in some sort include disobedience, either against an immediat superiour (as in every *Arch-heretick*) or at least against the common and general body of Pastors

All Schisme
doth begin
from some one
person.

A schisme
involving
heresie.

A schisme
involving
sacrilege.

A Schisme
consisting par-
ticularly in
disobedience.

Every Schism
doth involve
some disobe-
dience.

A&I5

Pastors and superiours of the whole Church, assembled ; for example, in an Occumenical Council ; or otherwise universally and unanimously consenting together. As if any of the Primitive Bishops, Priests, or Christians, should have disobeyed the Council of the Apostles held at *Ierusalem*, commanding to *abstain from strangled meat and blood* : or the like of the Council of *Nice* ; and so downwards of the succeeding Councils commands. So that I need not examine the Protestants disobedience in their *Schisme* from the Popes parsonal authority, being that would lead us into several questions, unuseful to my designe. However, we may evidently conclude, that whether a *Schisme* proceed from a doctrinal or practical tenet, universally believed and taught by the Catholick Church to be of Divine revelation or institution, or from any external act of worship of only ecclesiastical ordinance, whether universal or no ; or from any disputable question determined in a general Council ; or in fine from any quarrel and disagreement, in a matter either Ecclesiastical or civil, out of pure animosity and passionate interest ; It is, I say, evident that all *Schismes*, are still destructive of *Charity*, and consequently wicked and damnable.

The

The second Article.

That there is a Schisme, between the Protestants and the Roman Catholicks.

THat there is a *Schisme* or seperation betwixt all Protestants and the Roman Catholick Church, both in *necessary* points of doctrinal belief (I still call *necessary* points, all those which the Roman Catholick Church doth universally esteem to be so essential, as that no man can wittingly contradict any of them, and remain a member of that Church) and Divine worship in sacrifice or Sacrament, is most evident.

None can deny but that all Roman Catholicks do believe and reverence the Sacrifice of the *Masse*, as the most *substantial* & *essential* act of their Religion: All Protestants condemn and abhor it. No Roman Catholick will deny, but that the substance of bread is turned into the substance of Christs body in the holy Eucharist: No Protestant will believe and acknowledge it. No Catholick will receive the Sacrament of the Lords Supper at the hands of any Protestant Minister, saying his service and distributing his wine and bread after any of their several manners to their Congregations: no Protestant (if I mistake them not) will adore and receive the blessed Sacrament at the hands of a Romish Catholick Priest, celebrating *Masse*, and dispensing the sacred *Synaxis* of Christs true and real body to the faithful people. No Roman Catholick will de-

wherein is the Schism betwixt the Protestants and the Catholicks.

ny *Purgatory*, or disapprove praying for the solace help, and succour of the soules of the dead : No Protestant will acknowledge the first, or allow the second. No Roman Catholick will condemn praying to Saints, or deny but that there are seaven Sacraments of the New Testament instituted by Jesus Christ : No Protestant but will disavow both. No Catholick can professe the contrary to any of these tenets, but he must renounce his faith and Religion, and be cut off from the tree of life, the Catholick Church, as a rotten branch. Nor did I ever hear of any Protestant Congregation, which ever made profession of these points, as the Roman Catholicks do ; Nor do I believe, that if any Protestant should make profession of them, that he would be esteemed a Protestant. So that we may conclude, if any Roman Catholick should make profession, either in word or practise, of any thing contrary to these tenets, generally held as *necessary* articles by the universal Church, he would be no longer esteemed a Roman Catholick, but would be immediately rescinded from their communion : So likewise if any Protestant should believe and practise these points, as the Roman Catholicks do, he would certainly loose the title of a Protestant, and be no longer reputed one of theirs. Wherefore I conclude most evidently, that there is a seperation and *Schisme* betwixt them, and that in *substantial* points of doctrine, and *essential* acts of Religion.

The third Article.

That the Protestants and not the Roman Catholicks, are Schismatics.

THAT the Protestants, and not the Roman Catholicks are *Schismatics*, is no lesse evident then that there is a Schisme between them. Those must needs be *Schismatics*, who first left, deserted, and went out from the others (whether upon just grounds or no, is another question, which I conceive we have cleared and resolved in the precedent treatises) this being the very *essence* of a *Schismatick*, to seperate himself from that body or society, whereof he was a professed members. Thus if any person in a family, any family in a City, any City in a Province, or any Province in a state or Kingdome, do seperate themselves from the rest of their body, and under pretence of errors, innovations, and abuses in the Government, should fly out, and refuse to admit the *fundamental*, common, and universal lawes, and rules of Government, which all the rest of their fellow members do professe and acknowledge as such, and which they themselves have ever hitherto admitted and received; And hereupon would renounce their incorporation thereinto, and withdraw themselves from all participation of such *principal* functions, and *essential* duties, as the rest of the obedient members do perform; who can deny but that this party doth seperate and divide itself (whether

What is it to
be a Schisma-
tick.

justly or no, I still say, is another question) from that body whereof it was a member, and consequently is *schismatical*.

In like manner, if in the beginning of *Luthers* time, and before his revolt, all the Christians of *Europe* were all one Church, both in *substantial* points of Doctrine, and of sacred communion in Sacrifice and Sacraments, in *Italy, France, Spain, Germany, England, &c.* and that the Protestants did separate and divide themselves upon *Luthers* rebellion, or shortly after that time (which if I should expresse and declare upon what motives, and in what manner it was first begun and done in *England*, no modest English Protestant but would blush to see from what an infected root did first spring their unfortunate revolt) both in *substantial* points of Christian Doctrine, and *essential* practise of sacrificial and sacramental communion from the whole body of the Church in *Italy, France, Spain, Germany, &c.* and did flye out and refuse to believe the same Doctrine, and use the same Sacrifice and Sacraments (under pretence of errors, innovations, and abuses universally crept into the Church) which all the whole body of the Church did professe and practise at the same time, and which their forefathers, and they themselves had hitherto professed and practised: It must needs follow that they are the *Separatists* and *Schismatics*. This is so evident, that no understanding and unpassionate man can doubt of it, whatever some may say in heat of dispute, and to avoid the inconveniences that follow.

If it be answered, that the *Protestants of England* ought not to be esteemed *Schismaticks*, unless they have revolted against some Superiour Authority; which likewise ought not to be supposed, nor can be justly averred, being they deny the Pope hath any Authority over any Churches out of his own Territories. And for the Bishops of other Kingdomes, they never pretended any Authority over the Church of *England*; So that the Clergy and State of *England* might reform themselves, as they thought fit, without controul.

An evasion
of our Eng-
lish Proce-
ssants refused.

To this I answer, That it is true (as I said before) that no *Schism* of the nature whereof we speak, ever begun, or can begin, but by some one man, or *Arch heretick*, who at the first appearance of his revolt, had acknowledged Superiors; And therefore all *Schism* of this kind must necessarily be at the first from, and in opposition to some Authority. Yea, though we should suppose even the *Pope* himself to begin a *Schism*. And although to begin a *Schism* in the Church, it is not needful that it be in opposition, to or against the *Popes* Authority (as I said before) yet whether the *Pope* had not some acknowledged authority in *England*, yea, and more perhaps then in any part of the world, at the beginning of their *Schism*; whether, I say, he had not then at least so much Authority in *England*, as to be held and esteemed *Head of the Catholick Church* (whereof they were then professed members) as much as he was then, and is still by the Catholicks all other Nations in *Italy, France, Spain, Germany, &c.* And consequent-
ly

ly, that their revolt was then from, and against the Popes acknowledged Authority, let the English Protestants themselves be judge; witnesse their publick acts, the imprisonment of Bishops, the bloodshed both of Priests and Lay-men, and their enacted Statutes against the Popes Supremacy.

1 John 2.

But I will goe further, and suppose their Rebellion had not been in opposition to the Popes Authority in the beginning of their pretended Reformation, as if there had been no Pope actually living, or at least, no acknowledged Pope at that time, yet would their fact be still a *Schisme*. Both because it was a revolt and breach in the first beginner and opposer of the change against his immediate spiritual Superior; And in them all, from and against the unanimous authority and consent of the whole body of the Church: As also because it was a separation, or as *S. John* calls it, *a going out from us, who had they been truly one of us* (that is, of the Elect) *they had remained with us*. For though rebellion against authority be generally annexed to all *Schism*, especially in the first beginner and broacher of it (as it was in them) yet is it not the more essential part of *Schism*; for it sufficeth to make a *Schism*, or to be a *Schismatick*, that one separate and divide himself from that body or society whereof he was a member, and renounce all communion with it in such things as that body esteems essential to its subsistence. Wherefore, if before the Protestants pretended Reformation, the whole Catholick Church (whereof they were then members) was entirely

entirely united in all *substantial* Articles of Faith, and *essential* communion in Sacrifice and Sacraments; And that they have separated and sequestred themselves from the body of that Church in divers tenets and practises, which both did before, and doth still since their revolt, profess and acknowledge to be *substantial* and *essential* points of her Religion, and particularly in her Sacrifice and Sacraments (which are the principal acts of her Religion) it is impossible that thus separating themselves, they should not be Separatists, that is, *Schismaticks*.

Which is yet more clear, in that no *Schismaticks* will put the subject of their quarrel to the judgment and decision of the whole Church. For being a General Council is the Supreme Ecclesiastical Tribunal upon Earth, and that the Catholick Church doth not universally refuse communion to any of her members, but for matters thus judged and decided; It is evident, that the first Protestants refusing to stand to the Churches Supreme Judgment, doe in effect renounce her society, and therefore are *Schismaticks*, or Separatists. He is no longer a Citizen, but a Rebel, who will not acquiesce to, but resist and oppose the definitive sentence, and last decree of the supreme power of the State or Society wherein he lives as a member.

Schismaticks will not submit the subject of their Schism to the judgment of the Church.

The

The fourth Article.

That to live in Schism is a dangerous state for Christian soules.

THat it is a dangerous state for a Christian to be wittingly a *Schismatick*, that is, to live in an evident and known *Schism*, and separation from that Church, which was acknowledged by all Christians, by themselves before their revolt, and by their forefathers for many hundred yeares together, to be the true and onely Catholick Church; That it is, I say, a dangerous thing to live in this manner, me thinks it should need no proof to any unpassionate and understanding Christian, especially if he have any strong sentiment or feeling solicitude of his soules salvation. First, because divers learned Protestants themselves doe acknowledge it. Secondly, because all the Ancient Fathers of the Church have manifestly demonstrated it against the Schismatics of their times; yet for the better clearing of this important truth in our *schismatical* age, I will endeavour to search and cut into the bottom of this ulcer.

First therefore we are to note, that we have already shewed, that every *Schism* in or from what body soever, Ecclesiastical or political, spiritual or temporal, is a division or separation from the superiors of that body, whereof the first beginner of that *schism* was a member immediately before; and it may be, he was a chief Officer or Minister

1. Note, as before, that all Schism is a separation from superiors.

Minister in that body, as in the Commonwealth a Judge or Governour ; in an Army a Captain or Colonel ; in the Church a Priest or Bishop.

Secondly, that all divisions, rebellions, and *schisms*, doe tend of their own nature, to the destruction of the bodies wherein they happen (though it may chance otherwise sometimes for divers reasons) according to the measure of their quality and quantity. For unlesse union be preserved in every society, according to the fundamental lawes and common statutes of its government. And this to be judged by the present supreme power, and other superiours and Officers of the whole society, at the beginning of any revolt or *schism*, it is impossible any society should subsist and continue; witnesse our Saviours own words: *Every Kingdome divided against it self, shall be destroyed, and become desolate.* This union, I say, of parts and members, with their Heads and Governours, is so essentially necessary in all communities and societies whatsoever, as in Kingdoms, Commonwealths, Cities, Families, and the like, that nothing can be more evident. These Heads and Governours, of what quality soever (like roots in vegitals, and hearts in sensibles) give life and motion to the whole. The separation of a member from them, is presently its moral death. But if they perish and fail, the whole building falls immediately to the ground. Since therefore the Church of Christ (as we have shewed in the precedent Treatises) must necessarily be a community or society of men professing

2. Note that all schisme is destructive of the body wherein it happens.

Mat. 22.

Union necessary in every society.

the law of Christ, under the government of those visible heads and superiors, whom he himselfe hath instituted, and to whom alone he hath given the onely *infallible* meanes to make his law certainly known, and religiously observed; And consequently, who doth not live under this government, and receive the law of Christ from these Governours, cannot (generall speaking) be assuredly and properly a Christian; It doth evidently follow, that every *schismatical* act in the Church, is of its own nature destructive of the Christian society, according to its measure and proportion; And that the separated part, loosing its communion both with the Heads or Governours, and with all the rest of the parts of that body, remains no longer a living member thereof.

Whence proceeds the greatness of the sinne of Schism.

Whence it follows likewise, that every *schismatical* act, is a lesse or greater sin (all circumstances concurring alike) according as the body or society wherein it happens, is of lesse or greater importance. And so the destruction of a *family* by an internal *schism* or division, is not so great a sin, as the destruction of a *City*, nor of a *City* as of a *Shire*; nor of a *Shire* as of a *State* or *Kingdome*. Now it is evident, that the society of the Christian and Catholick Church, *Christs own spouse and mystical body*, is a society of the greatest importance that can be upon earth, being the onely congregation wherein eternal salvation is to be had. Wherefore it doth necessarily follow, that a *schismatical* act, tending to the division, and consequently to the destruction of this sacred society, and to the ruine of all those who may be involved

involved in this unhappy separation, is a most horrid and damnable sin. And surely, the continuance in such a *schism*, knowing it to be such, is a crime little inferior to the first broaching and beginning of it.

I may here demand of the Protestants, whether all that society, which is now called the Roman Catholick Church, that is, which is in communion together in belief and practise under that denomination, was not once, to wit, in the first three or four hundred yeares after Christ, yea, and immediately before the Protestants began their *schism* (being there was then no other Catholick Church) was not, I say, that Catholick Church to which so many eminent Titles are attributed, and so many gracious blessings are given in the holy Scriptures? And to which obedience is due, as being often commanded by our Saviour Jesus Christ himself? And which once, at least, had and possessed Christs true Doctrine? Then I demand again, whether this Church hath not continually persevered and subsisted without interruption, at least in an external and visible congregation of men pretending still to professe the same doctrine & Religion, and living in communion in Sacrifice and Sacraments until this day? Which if both be true (as the Protestants themselves doe acknowledge they are) I demand further, upon what ground ought or may any man oppose this whole Catholick Church, and flye out from it, call it to be the whore of *Babylon*; an adulterous and erroneous harlott? will any slight proof, any weak argu-

That the Roman Catholick Church was once the true Catholick Church.

ment, any seeming reason or motive be a sufficient warrant for any man to defame in this manner that Church, which is generally esteemed to be the spouse of Christ? nay to separate and divorce himself from her? ought he not to have such manifest demonstrations, such evident convictions, and such impregnable arguments, as that no man can be so stupid, so blind, and so void of sense, but that he must be overcome at the first proposal of them? were not otherwise this man, whosoever he be, to be justly reputed a collumniator, and deservedly esteemed a Rebel.

Pride is the
root of all
Schism.

Hence we may clearly see, that the spring and root of all *Schisme*, is the pride and arrogance of humane corrupted nature; which appears in that the Ringleaders of, and knowing continuers in such a *Schisme*, will not take the rule of their divine faith and sacred practise from the authorized governors and superiours of the present universal Church, whereof they are members, but will only believe, what they think fit of their own head, and from their own particular interpretation of the Scriptures or fathers, and not from what they hear and see universally taught and practised throughout the whole present Catholick Church in their time; but will correct and controule what they please, though only one man at the first against the whole world. So that the only ground whereupon a *Schismatick* builds his Christian belief, and the lawfulness of his revolt, in opposition to all the learning, and piety of the Catholick Church, is his own private judgment or phantasie, whereas the univer-
sal

sal authority and unanimous consent in divine doctrine and service, of the present Catholick Church wherein this *Arch heretick* did live before his sepeation, and against which he *doth raise his horns*, ought to be his *infallible* motive, and immoveable rock, whereupon to settle and ground his Christian belief, and divine service.

Hence it followes again, that how much or little soever of Christian doctrine and divine worship, any private person may believe or deny upon this ground, that is, upon his own phansie or judgment, it cannot be said, that the like would be a sufficiently-certain rule, motive, or method, for the whole Church to rest and build her faith and practise upon. For this very particular (*Schismatick*) or whosoever proceeds upon the same principle) building his divine faith and practise upon his own private judgment framed out of Scriptures or Fathers, may change his belief the next day, for any thing we know, according as he may be worse or better informed. And therefore if there were no stay nor ground more constant and secure to build and settle the general faith and practise of all our Christian Religion upon, then each private mans opinion or phansie, there would be nothing in Christian Religion generally and universally certain to all, as we have more fully shewed in the precedent Treatises.

Hence it followes again, that to fail in any one point of Christian doctrine, which is of such necessity

Every mans private judgment cannot be a sufficient rule for the common an Catholick faith.

He that believes not all the articles of our faith hath no Catholick faith.

Jac. 2.

Luke 10.
Matth. 18.

An objection

cessity, as that to contradict it, it were to be esteemed an heretick by the whole Catholick Church, is indeed to have no Catholick faith at all. For though such an one may beelive divers other articles and perhaps all but that, and that his faith in regard of those which he doth believe, may in some sort be called *Divine*, yet *he that sins in one is made guilty of all*. The reason is evident, for we cannot believe in any one point or article of our Christian faith, because the Catholick Church teacheth it to be such, but we must also believe all other points and articles which the same Catholick Church doth teach, in the same manner, and upon the same ground, to be of the same nature and quality. And consequently we must of necessity either believe all or none upon that principle. Whence it is, that all *Schismes*, of this nature whereof we speak, do spring from this only root of disbelieving and contradicting the present Catholick Church. How dangerous a thing it is not to hear, believe, and obey the present universal Church, in what age soever we consider it, is sufficiently shewed in the precedent treatises, and our Saviour himself tells it us in a word, saying: *He that heareth you heareth me; he that despiseth you, despiseth me; He that will not hear the Church, let him be to you like a heathen or publican.*

Nor is it sufficient for any Protestant to say (though I think none wil) I believe all the articles that you Catholicks believe, and I am ready to do all the acts of Religion that you doe; but I will
neve--

neverthelesse communicate also with the Protestants in all their acts of Religion. For though this man seems not to be a *Schismatick*, because he is ready to perform all the acts of Religion which the Roman Catholicks doe, and therefore thinks he doth not separate himself from that Church, yet in effect he doth, being he joynes and unites himself to a *Schismatical* Congregation, and that in the most *substantial* points of their misbelief and sacrilegious actions of their Divine worship, whereby he makes himself one of them; And by his communion in their sacrilegious service, who are a separated sect, he excludeth himself from the society of the truly-faithful. And *what commerce hath Christ with Belial? What Part can a believer have with an unbeliever: what society can there be betwixt light and darknesse? what consent betwixt that temple of God and the Idoles?* 2 Cor. 6.

The Church is the *spouse of Christ*, and her union with him, as a body with its head, is so often and so expressly testified by the Apostle, that tis strange any Christian shall dare either slander or defame her so boldly as our adversaries do; or tear or rend her in sunder so impiously as all *Schismaticks* do. *You are called* (saith the Apostle) *by God, into the society and fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Now I beseech you brethren, that you all speak the same thing, nor that there be no Schisme nor division amongst you, but that you be perfectly joyned together, &c.* And discoursing of the several functions of divers members in a natural body, with comparison to the mystical body of Christ, the Church, he saith: *That there should* 1 Cor. I.

12. *should be no Schisme in the body, but that the members*
 14. *should have the same solicitude & care of one another,*
&c. You are, (saith he) the body of Christ; for
God is not the author of confusion, but of peace in all
the Churches of the saints. And he exhorts the E-
 Eph. 4. *phesians, to keep the unity of the spirit in bond*
of peace. Where he calleth again the Church, The
 Jud. 19. *body of Christ, from whom, saith he, the whole body*
 Joh. 1. 2. *is fitly joynd together, and compacted by that which*
every joynt supplyeth, &c. And S. Jude, These be
they who seporate themselves, sensual, not having the
spirit. And S. John saith: They went out from
us, &c. As before. And in his Gospel Christ
praying his Father for his Apostles, or Church,
saith: Keep those whom thou hast given me, that they
may be one as we are. What a dreadful punish-
ment was inflicted upon the schisme of Chore,
Dathan, and Abiron, though only for a division
made in the Jewish Synagogue; a bare type
and shadow of the Church of Christ. But I will
not swell up this small appendix with those fearful
and severe places and passages of the holy scrip-
tures, wherein schisme is strictly prohibited,
severely punished, and many woeful curses
threatned upon all those who either cause it, or
continue in it.

The like might be testified by the general consent of all the fathers from age to age, who doe clearly signifie the dangerous state of schisme, their works being full of arguments and convictions against the *schismaticks* of their times respectively, which according to our Saviours predictions have not been wanting, either more or lesse,

leſſe, in almoſt every age It is ſufficient for my preſent deſigne to have made it evident, that *ſchiſme* of its own nature, is diſtructive of the body wherein it hapens, as alſo of thoſe members who ſeperate themſelves from their body; and conſequently, that no cauſe can juſtifie *the firſt breaching* of a *Schiſme*, or make it lawful for any particular perſon to ſtand out againſt the whole body, which *S. Auſtin* expreſſly proveth in his 48. Epistle.

I will not ſay but that diſeaſes and diſorders, may grow in any body or ſociety whatſoever, and that it is ſometimes requiſite to repair ſuch defects, and purge ſuch corruptions, as being increaſed to any conſiderable pitch, either by exanation and neglect, or by exuberance and exceſſe, may tend to its detriment. Yet ſure, this is not to be done (at leaſt in ſuch things as concern the very *effence*, and *ſubſtance*, of the whole body) by every or any particular member, without the conſent of, much leſſe in oppoſition and contradiction to the to the heads and Governours of the whole ſociety. General defects in all ſocieties may be repaired by a General conſent of the ſupream powers (when that can be had) and of all thoſe who by their qualities and offices, having a guiding part and a ſuperiour authority in the Government or ſuch a body; or at leaſt, by the conſent of the greater part of the ſociety; but never by any private and particular perſon, or ſmall party, with an univerſal oppoſition to them all. Particular abuſes and diſorders, which only concern ſome private perſons, or at

Bad cuſtoms
or abuſes are
to be corre-
cted in the
Church.

most some particular Church or Congregation, either Diocesan, Metropolitan, or National, must be corrected with the consent of only that part or congregation. Nay, sometimes a private man may give advise and instruction for the remedy of such defects as concern the whole body, unto the superiours and governnors thereof, so it be done with prudence and humility. But that any private person, or any particular congregation or Church of this society, shall controule, correct, and change, at his or their pleasures, what he or they shall think fit, and this in any point of divine doctrine, or religious practice, how *essential* or *substantial* soever in relation to the substance of the whole body; And this again not only without the approbation or consent, but even in opposition and contradiction to the supream governors and all the rest of the whole society; This I say, were to open a wide gape to all sedition and *schisme*, and consequently to the distruction of all societies, whether ecclesiastical or civil. Wherefore, I still conclude with *S. Austin* as before, that there can be no just cause of a *Schisme*, or rebellion in the Church; that is, for a particular person, or part, to be the author thereof against the whole body.

shall any one parish Priest, or Minister, correct and change when & as he shall think fit, the most *substantial* points of doctrine, and most *essential* acts of Religion, professed and practised over all the diocesse wherein he lives? And this in opposition and contradiction to his Bishop, to all his fellow Priests or Ministers, and all their faithful flock

flock of the whole diocesse? Shall any one Bishop do it, with the like oppositon to his Metropolitan and all the rest of his fellow Bishops, Priests, and faithful people of the whole Arch-bishoprick? Shall any one Arch-bishop do it, with the like oppositions to his Primat, and all the rest of the Aich-bishops, their Suffragans, Priests, and Catholick people within that primacie? Or shall any Primat doe the like, with the same opposition to the Pope, and all other Primats, Arch-bishops, Bishops, Priests, and faithful subjects of the whole Church, out of this Primacie; Muchlesse, shall any one particular layman doe the like. We may likewise add, that every such revolt, or *schisme* of a Priest, Bishop, Arch-bishop, or Primat is not only in opposition to his immediat superiour, and the rest of that superiours Congregation (as of a Parish Priest against his Bishop, and all his Diocesse) but it is also in opposition to the belief and practise of the whole Church throughout all the world. What confusion, what disorder, must not this position, if it were allowed, necessarily inferr? And what I say of persons within the order of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchie, the same hath yet more force against any Apostata Monk, or Fryar, as *Luther* was. For besides their rebellion against their Divinely-appointed, and canonical Judges (which is Schismatical and damnable) they have also their regular superiours against whom their revolt is impious, and sacrilegious, by reason of their vow of obedience.

Nor can it be said that such a parish Priest, or Minister, procuring the whole parish to joyn with

him, or such a Bishop his whole diocesse, or such a Metropolitan his whole Archbishoprick; or such a Primat his whole Primacy, may begin and effect such a reform within the extent of their precincts respectively. For still it will be supposed, that this their revolt and separation, is in opposition to the supream Governnors, and rest of the whole Catholick Church: Not only I say, without their consent, but even expressly contrary to their universal belief and practise; yea, and this in things which are generally esteemed *fundamental* and *essential*, and which therefore commonly concern them all; as either in a *substantial* article of Catholick doctrine, or a *substantial* practise of Religion, (that is, which is esteemed such by all the rest of the Catholick Church) and consequently must needs be wicked and damnable, as involving both *heresie* and *Schisme*: Or in an unnecessary and lesse important tenet of doctrine or practise of Religion (but universally believed and practised) and then it is likewise damnable, as being a *Schisme* against charity tearing and rending a sunder the society of the Catholick Church, Christs mystical body, which is indeed to destroy Christianity.

Nor can it be likewise said that any particular Bishop (of England for example) was any otherwise a particular member of the Church of England at the beginning of their *Schisme*, then was the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* and all the Bishops Priests, and faithful people of that Kingdome, members of the universal Church of Christ. And therefore, what the particular Church of England did

did, by seperating and dividing itself from the universal Church; the like might any particular Bishop of England have done as lawfully, in seperating and dividing himself (I still speak of matters only belonging to Religion) from the rest of the Church of England. Yea, the like might any Parish Priest have done as lawfully, separating himself from his Bishop; yea, or any lay-man separating himself from them all, supposing he conceived they erred grossly in what they taught and practised in Religion: So that in fine, we must either oblige all particular persons of what quality soever, all parts, portions, and particular Congregations of the universal Church (under what civil government soever they live) not to separate, divide, and rescind themselves from the supream Governours and rest of the body of the Catholick Church (even not upon any occasion, muchlesse in *substantial* points of doctrine, or *essential* acts of Religion, that is, which the universal Church doth believe to be such, at the beginning of such a Schisme) but that they must mutually conserve their union and their reciprocal Communion in all *substantial* acts of religion, both amongst themselves in every particular Congregation, Diocesan, Metropolitan, and National; As also with the supream Governours, and members of the whole Catholick society in all other Nations. Otherwise we must give way to all and every particular Congregation, yea to every person, to separate and divide themselves into as many several professions of divers and contrary points of doctrine, and

and practises of Religion, how *essential* or *substantial* soever, as there be clergie-men : yea, as there lay men or women in the whole body of the Catholick Church ; which is in effect to make so many Religious, and by making so many, to make none at all,

Another refuge of our English Protestants.

But perhaps our Protestants last refuge in favour of their *Schisme* will be, that the King, state, and Parliament of any Kingdome, or common wealth, may enact such laws and statutes, as will either directly, or at least indirectly, seperate the Clergy, and by consequence the laity of that Kingdome or state, from all dependance and superiority of any foreraign power and iurisdiction. And this legislative power is essentially necessary to the supream authority of every Kingdome or common-wealth, being they cannot otherwise prevent such dangers and disorders as might by the acknowledgment of such external authority over them, tend to their prejudice and destruction.

Catholicks dependence of the Pope doth not prejudice their duty to their civil Magistrat

To answer fully and amply, the political part of this evasion, would require a deeper research into the nature of the supream power of all civil government, and into states affaires, then I intend to make for the present. But so far as concerns the Ecclesiastical part, I can evidently demonstrate (if it were necessary, or required of me) that what dependance soever the Protestants conceive, that the Bishops and Catholicks of any particular state or Kingdome hath of the Pope, or of any other forereign power or iurisdiction, that their dependance truly understood in its own

own nature, and for as much as is necessary according to the true, & universally acknowledged principles of our Catholick Religion, doth not carry with it the least shadow of danger to any political state, though in actual opposition with the Pope, either in Armes or Religion. But contrarywise, that our Catholick doctrine, rightly understood, doth strictly engage and oblige the very consciences and souls of Christians, to a perfect and indispensible obedience to their civil Magistrates in all things belonging to the political government, of what profession in Religion soever the Governors be.

Yet clear and certain it is on the other side, that no civil nor secular supream power of any King, state, or Parliament, can or ought to correct, alter, or change any *essential* article of our Christian doctrine, or *substantial* practise of our Christian Religion (I mean which all Catholicks do believe to have been revealed, or instituted by Jesus Christ) or enact any thing against Christian charity. Wherefore their ordinances can never legitimate a *Schisme* (being every *Schisme* is against charity, as we have already shewed) nor abrogate any point of Christian doctrine or practise, which the universal Church doth teach to be a revealed truth, or a divine institution. Being this were in effect to have power to abolish Christianity: For if they could annul any one point of doctrine or practise, which the universal Church doth teach to be *revealed* and *Divine*, they might do the like of an other and so of all.

The Civil power cannot abrogate any thing that is of Divine institution.

Nor

Nor will it help the businesse, though we suppose the Bishops, Clergy, and Divines of such a state or Kingdome, should joyn with the civil power to enact these unjust laws, wrought thereunto by faction, promises, threatens. For this were onely to make them also partakers of the same crime, who ought to resist it with the losse of their lives.

Nor can it be said, that every supream secular Magistrate in their severall states respectively, no not even Christians, much lesse heathens, Turks, Pagans, Infidels hath an illimited power to ordain what ever he pleaseth both in humane and divine affaires, both concerning civil government, and divine worship; or that he can ordain nothing so exorbitant and extravagant of what nature soever, either concerning God or Man, but it ought to be obeyed. This being in effect to make him a God, as I could easily demonstrate upon the grounds briefly set down in the last chapter of the second treatise, before this *Appendix*. Where the lawes of nature, and of divine institution, are cursorily shewed to be above the reach of any mans power, or of any power that can be given to man by humane means. Nor consequently ought any superiours commands to be obeyed, supposing they be contrary to the laws of nature, or of divine institution.

Would supream secular powers, Kings, and Potentates seriously consider, what rules our Lord gave the Jewes, when they had a mind to have a King, whereof amongst others (now quite forgotten and altered) one was that he should

take

take a copie of the law from the Priests of the Tribe of Levi, and read it all the dayes of his life ; that is, he was to know and receive the law by tradition, from the hands of the Priests ; To whom he was to have recourse in case of hard questions and difficulties, whereof they were to be interpreters and Judges. Would Kings, I say, and Potentates observe the rules there mentioned, their Dominion would be more sweet, and their subjects burdens more easie. Nay, and such prophane and irreligious authours as give even Priestly power to Kings and Monarches, might learn by the Sacrilegious fact of proud *Ozias*, that tis not for Kings, or secular soveraignes to usurp sacerdotal functions, nor to offer incense upon the alters of the Lord, *It is not their office but the Priests, who are consecrated to perform that function.* And if any should persist (as *Ozias* did) to threaten the Priests, let him remember, what a foul and fearful plague fell upon him, for his impious enterprize. Dent. 17. 2 Paralip. 17.

Hence we may conclude, that whosoever professeth himself a Christian, I mean, really and truly a Christian, believing that Jesus Christ, God and Man, hath delivered a revealed doctrine of supernatural faith, and divine institutions of religious practise; such a man, I say, must necessarily acknowledge, that no authority upon earth, nor Ecclesiastical nor Civil, can either abrogate what Christ hath thus revealed and instituted, or command any thing evidently contrary thereunto, which might cause and make a schisme.

Christians are chiefly obliged to acknowledge the principles of Religion to be immutable.

Finally, it is manifest out of what we have

G g g

said,

It is not for
want of
charity that
Catholicks
judge of
Protestants

said, how unjustly and unworthily the Protestants do accuse us of want of charity, because we say, that such impious *negatives* as some of them maintain, and such wicked *Schismes* as theirs, do lead men to eternal perdition. For certainly, if there be any Christian truth, any Catholick Religion, any divine faith delivered and taught; or any sacred worship instituted by Christ, as generally necessary to mankind for their attaining unto eternal salvation (which were blasphemious for any Christian to deny) it is as clear as the Sun, that whatsoever doth tend to the ruine thereof, is to be hated and detested by all Christians. And this, if I mistake not, we have evidently shewed, to be the proper and natural effect of *Schisme* and *heresie*. But we cannot so easily, and certainly determine what is to be judged of every particular and individual *Protestant*, who is in these *Schismes* and *heresies*. For although we certainly know, and can infallibly judge of this, and every other notorious sin, according to the natural kind, and common *species* of it, considered in itself, as of *theft*, *murder*, *adultery*, and the like, and with no lesse certainty of *heresie* and *schism*, to wit, that of themselves and in their own nature they are damnable crimes; yet ought we to judge very cautiously and charitably of every particular mans condition and actions, in which these material evils are contained, being these mens government and actions may be involved in many such circumstances as are wholly unknown unto us. We all know drunkenness is a damnable sin, yet have I seen divers men drunk without

It is one thing
to judge of
the state of
a Schismatick,
and another
to judge of
the person of
a Schismatick.

without any offence upon several occasions. It is of small importance to be judged by man, and the sacred text teacheth all Christians, that he that judgeth rashly, shall be severely judged. Who doth certainly foresee the deep secrets of the eternal fathers wisdom, providence, predestination, who can penetrate into the inscrutable heart of man? wherefore I conceive, that as we may judge, without failing of the enormity of the crime of *Schisme*, considered in general; Sought wee to judge with all possible charity and moderation of the crime of *Schisme*, as it is included in the state and actions of a particular *Schismatick*.

The evidence of these truths would make me wonder, that so many wise, learned, and morally vertuous Protestants, should not understand and embrace them; Had not my long and dayly study of man, my often reflecting wit experience upon mens several interessed dispositions and upon the infinity of waies whereby mens judgments are corrupted and depraved; but especially upon the force of education and custome, not only in those whose understandings are of a law and narrow capacity, but even in those whose conceptions are more quick and lively, and consequently their phantasies generally more averie and irregular; Had not, I say, this kind of study and experience quite made me cease from wondring at any extravagance, how great soever, which dayly appears in mens words and actions, I should certainly have thought it impossible. But I see we must conclude, that

Pſalm 17.
John 3.
Pſalm 144.

he only can remedy our defects, and rectifie our errours, *who enlightheth our darkneſſe, and breatheth where he pleaſeth.* At whoſe all-knowing and all merciful judgments ſeat, as we may hope a bounteous and liberal reward for our poor endeavours, ſo ought we feare a juſt and deſerved puniſhment for our wilful blindneſſe.

FINIS.



HAVING translated this book, I sent to its author Dr. *Hammonds* treatise of *Schisme*, desiring his opinion of it : whereunto he presently returned me this short answer; which I thought might not unfitly be annexed unto this *Appendix*. Though it come in time so farr short, as Dr. *Hammonds* book hath been by another answered, and a reply long since made to the answerer, who hath rejoyned with the Dr. yet this fit of printing have taken me, I so much esteem the authors judgment and learning, as I would venter to print herewith any thing of his on this subject I had not seen; much more this, which I think very well worth the reading, even by him that hath read the other answers; and the same is to be said for that which he calls his Postscript, being observations on the Bishop of *Deris* book on the same subject.

SIR,

HAVING attentively read over Dr. *Hammonds* small, but learned treatise of *Schisme*, in defence of the Church of England, I easily resolved to give you briefly, as you request, my opinion of it; being I conceive the principles I have laid in the book you have taken the pains to translate, do clearly shew his mistakes. And I verily believe, if so wise and learned a man had seriously and sadly perused that book, before he writ this, he would either have changed the grounds of his defence, or sought some other more solide way,

way, to free his dispersed, broken, and afflicted Congregation from *schisme*, or not have written at all.

First then, Sir, I must confesse my ignorance in that I know not what our Protestants mean, when they talk of the *Church of England*. I know they say they have Bishops; But the greatest, and most illustrious part of the Christian world, the Roman Catholick Church, believes both their *Mission* and *Ordination* to be invalide and null. The Presbyterians and all sectaries deride them. They say they have *Priests* and people living under the Government and discipline of these Bishops, and consequently have a Church. But how easily soever this might be disproved, I will, for the present, suppose it, for this learned authors sake. Yet sure we must find some *union* in this Church. Which I may likewise suppose this authour will allow. But wherein must this *Vnion* consist? Three things certainly it must necessarily contain. *Subordination* in and *Obedience* to Hierarchical authority. *Vnanimous consent* in all *essential* points of Christian doctrine. And a perfect *uniformity* in all *substantial* acts of Christian Religion.

The first I will omit to speak of, because I will question nothing that hath any apparence, likelihood, or possibility of truth. But for the other two (without which there can be no Church, since we suppose them to be *essential* and *substantial* parts of it) I cannot imagine where to seek and find them out in the *Church of England*. I neither know what I may say are *essential* points
of

of doctrine different from *Catholicks*, in the *Church of England*; nor where they are set down by the unanimous consent of that national Congregation. If they send me to the *Bible*; I see it is made a nose of wax. If to the Councils and fathers of the first 300. yeares without a judge or Arbitrator, I am in a greater darknesse then before. If to the 39. Articles, I do not only see the most famous members of their Church, disclaim the greater part of them; but I hear even all of them universally acknowledge, they are not of any *divine* and *infallible* certainty, and therefore may be withstood by any conscientious man of a contrary perswasion. If to the acts of their *Convocations* and *Parliaments*, none of them, that I know of, will allow either the one or the other, to be the rule of their *Christian* and *divine* faith; nor any way able to point out, *infallibly* and *with obligation*, what every man ought to believe. And lastly, if to their *Authors*, It will first be hard for me, to separate the *Protestants* from the *Puritants*. And when I shall have done that, I am certain I shall not be able to specify any one positive article wherein they differ from us, and agree amongst themselves. The same may be said of their *substantial* acts in Christian Religion. For neither do I know any they have distinguished from ours, nor common with us, wherein they all agree amongst themselves: for example, *Prayer*, *Baptisme*, *the Lords supper*: More *essential* acts of Religion then these amongst them I know not. Of the first, there is no form so essential as may not be wholly omitted, or totally changed

changed either by the *Parliament* or *convocation*, and consequently by any conscientious man (doing it without scandal) as not being of *divine institution*. The other two are no lesse differently believed and practised amongst them: as in relation to their *necessity*, to the *nature* and substance of their being, to their *effects*, to the manner of their administration, and the like. Wherein, if there be any uniformity amongst some, it is not held to be of *divine institution*, nor consequently *infallible and immutable*, but only of humane ordinance. Wherefore to tell me of the *Protestant Church of England*, as distinguished from the *Roman Catholick Church*, which hath either an unanimous consent in all *essential* points of Christian doctrine; or an absolute uniformity in all *substantial* acts of Christian Religion (without which there can be no Church) is to tell me of a Congregation, I never yet saw nor understood.

However, although we should acknowledge their Bishops to be truly and validly consecrated and therefore to have iurisdiction over their flocks, as essentially annexed to their character; that they were of unanimous consent in all *essential* points of Christian doctrine, as well in those wherein they agree with us, as in those wherein they differ from us; And that they had a perfect uniformity in all the *substantial* acts of Christian Religion, as well in what they agree with us, as in what they differ from us. Yet if such Bishops do separate themselves (upon what occasion soever) from the rest of the body of that whole Church whereof they were a member in communion of Sacrifice and

and Sacraments (I say, though they should continue to say Masse in the same manner as the rest of the Church doth, and administer the same Sacraments) yet were they truly *Schismaticks*. But if they should come to deny wilfully any article, which the rest of the whole Church, whereof they were a member, doth hold to be an *essential* point of her *revealed doctrine*; or wilfully refuse to practise any act of Religion which the rest of the said whole Church doth practise as of *divine institution*; then I say, thus separating themselves, they would be both *Schismaticks* and *hereticks*. This doth follow evidently out of the principles laid in the book which you have translated. But to the book.

I much respect the authors learning and moderation, whose *dissertationes de juribus Episcopatus*, against Monsieur Blondelle I have read with much satisfaction; but of his English writings this only hath come to my hands, yet I have heard a good report both of him and them; and therefore should be sorry, that what I writ to you in freedom, should any way offend him, in case it should come to his sight.

In his first chapter or introduction, there be Chap. I. divers things which might be called in question. But I will touch nothing unnecessarily: Only I remark that he grants (and cites the testimonies of the fathers for it, which I willingly omitted in my short Appendix) what I was forced and chiefly aymed to prove, because it was often denied to my face by some of his Church, which is, that all, *Schisme* is a *dammable crime*; and that

to live in a known Schisme, is a dangerous state.

In this second chapter I note, that he rightly describes the nature of *schisme* in general, and proves that an *excommunicated* person, precisely in that he is only excommunicated, is not properly a *Schismatick*. Yet by his leave he drives not the naile to the head. For a person deservedly excommunicated, if he wilfully remain in excommunication, he is a *Schismatick*, because he doth wittingly and wilfully remain out of the Church, the doors being open for his return if he please. So that in effect it is all one, whether he went out of the Church of himself at the first, or was put out, being now he may, and will not return; and therefore, is wilfully out, and consequently a *Schismatick*.

His long discourse of one supposed to be unjustly excommunicated, is nothing to our purpose. Only he might have noted, that a superiour or Judge his sentence, ought generally to be esteemed just and lawful. Who shall otherwise be judge, in such a case? especially when there is no appeal to a higher power? what invincible evidence ought not every re-fractory and rebellious subject produce for himself?

Whereas he saith it is possible, nay justly supposable that some particular Church may demand such conditions, as men, without wilful acknowledgment of *untruths*, cannot undergoe, and consequently be admitted into communion with it. Here he mistakes, speaking in relation to the *Roman Church*. For neither any particular Church nor Dioceſan, nor Metropolitan, nor National,

nor the Pope himself, can put any conditions, I mean in points of doctrine (whereof he speaks under the name of *untruths*) but only such as the whole universal and Catholick Roman Church doth exact. Wherefore his whole discourse is nothing to our purpose, running upon such suppositions as cannot happen according to the true grounds of our Catholick Religion, as they are declared in the book you have translated, Where I have said, that what any learned and Catholick authours have or do publikely maintain, without being condemned by the universal Church, the maintaining of such a position, though it were an *untruth* in itself, cannot be a just cause of excommunication. So that his whole discourse failes, by still supposing that to be reconciled to the Church it is necessary to renounce some part of *divine truth and Christian practise*, which is, to suppose the justice of his cause before he plead.

He presseth much that the *Church of Rome* being not *infallible* (as he thinks, and will suppose) it may oblige us to acknowledge errors. Which first we say is build upon a false supposition. Secondly, though the *Church of Rome* were not *infallible*, and might therefore possible teach and command an error, is she not therefore to be obeyed? Shall every private man, or particular Church, be judge of this or that article, which he supposeth the Roman Catholick Church may insert into her confession of faith, whether it be an error or no? Will he say the same of the civil Magistrats judgment or sentence? But I think I have demonstrated in the book you have transla-

ted, that the Roman Catholick Church cannot take into her Creed, or Catalogue of articles of divine faith, any new doctrines, nor consequently any new errors; which was the whole scope and chief intent of that book.

Whence it follows, that the Catholick Roman Church can require no more, in matter of belief, of him who desires to return, and to be reincorporated into her society, than of one who never was disobedient, which, it seems, this authour did not know.

Being willing to grant all that possibly I can to this author, I will passe his supposition, which is, that one who is out of the Church, may better discover such errors and untruths as may be in it than those who live in it, all circumstances concurring alike. But let me ask him, I pray, when they are discovered and divulged, can no body see them but they? Are we all blind: or are those errors so obscure? If so obscure, those sharp sighted discoverers of them, may perhaps be mistaken. If evident, it is strange that all the learning of the Catholick Church, should be turned into such a blockish ignorance; but above all we English priests and Catholicks, who against all possible humane interest of life and fortune, moving us (I had almost said, forcing us) to understand and embrace this discovery, and yet we still remain (as he must say) perversly wilful in a profound stupidity, but as we think, constant in an *infallible* security. I wish he would conceive better of us, than to be quite void of common sense to our owne so great disadvantage.

Some

Some suffer and are ruined at whom, other mourn and passe their days in foreraign Nations. repea-ting often with the Poet *Nos patriam fugimus, et dulcia linquimus arva*; and all this for want of a little reason or reading.

In this third chapter I find the fundamental mistakes of his whole book. His distinction of the unity of the Church is lame, not knowing our grounds, which if he understood as well as you, or had he read what you have translated, I am confident so learned a man would have built his arguments upon better principles. Chap. 3.

One of his chief mistakes, consists in that he conceiveth, That *communion superadds nothing to the unity of the Church, but an external association, either by assembling to worship God in the same place; or by communicatory letters.* Not a word of any essential act in this worship of God. Not communion in the same Sacrifice, and in the same Sacraments. Not a lawful mission in the Minister, or administrator of them, and of the worship and word of God, which are the most substantial parts and acts of any Religion. You know what I say of this in my *Appendix*. I wonder not, that this learned Doctor falleth into an infinity of mistakes from this supposition. Hence he supposeth, that *Schisme* is only a breach in not meeting together at such or such a material place, or not writing to the Bishops of another nation. I doe believe with him, that every *Schisme* must involve some disobedience (as you know I have said in my *appendix*) though it be not the more essential part of a *schisme*. For it is evident that
some

some body must first open his mouth, and propose the occasion of a *schisme*; And then, either all alone, or getting more to joyn with him, must first start out and be a *schismatick*. This one body must sure live under some Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, whereunto his proposition and leperation will be then opposite, as not being of that belief at that time; and therefore, this mans act must needs involve *disobedience*. I doe likewise acknowledge with this Doctor, that subordination of the *Laiety* to the *Presbitery*, and of the *Presbitery* to the *Bishops*, is of *divine right and institution*: But this I acknowledge not upon his grounds. Nor should I believe it indeed, unless besides all the authorities which he citeth, and many better cited by Catholics, I could likewise demonstrat it by *universal tradition*. But how will he prove the subordination of *Bishops* to *Metropolitans*, and of *Metropolitans* to *Primats* (which he conceiveth is not a distinct order from *Patriarchs*) to be of the same (I mean *divine* not *Apostolical*) institution, that I cannot tell. Nor also why we must stop at a *Primat* and go no higher. He must by his account acknowledge, both that there are as many *heads* in the whole Catholick Church in general, as there be *Primats* in the Christian world. As also, that no *Primat* can be a *Schismatick*, because he hath no Ecclesiastical superiour, muchlesse no *King* or *Soveraign*. There be divers *Soveraignies* would be glad he could makethis good? And our *Primats* in *France* of *Lions*, *Sans*, *Rhienes*, *Bourges*, *Roven*, &c. And all the rest in *Europe*, would wonder to see
 themselve,

themselves become so many Popes.

I must confesse I know not how he intends to make the whole Christian and Catholick Church one; if neither in *one head*, nor in the same *substantial* articles of Christian belief; nor in the same *essential* acts of Religion. To tell me that by meeting in one place it is *one*. First, that is impossible, in respect of the whole Church in general. Besides, men of several persuasions, and of several worships in Religion, even *substantially* different from one another, may meet in the same place, as they doe in *Germany*, and I believe have often done in *England*, who sure cannot be said to be of the same Church. That *communicatory* letters should so unite the whole body of Christians, as to make them all of one Church, that is not imaginable; though such a communion might perhaps entertain a civil commerce amongst Christians, as moral honest men.

He alledgeth many places which seem to limit the *Bishop of Romes Jurisdiction*. But he must give me leave to tell him, they are understood of the *Bishop of Rome* as he is a *Patriarch*, but not as *First* and *Head* of the whole Church.

He allowes the Pope to be the *first* Bishop and Patriarch in *order* or *priority* [of place (wherein he comes neerer to the *essential* part of the Popes Primacy then he is aware of) but will not acknowledge any power over *Primats* or *Patriarchs*, save only that of the Emperour, and of other *Soveraignes* in their Dominions respectively. I wish he had told us, whether and how he distinguisheth

eth betwixt the civil or temporal power, and the spiritual or Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. We know the *holy Ghost hath put Bishops to rule or govern the Church of God*, but never heard that Kings or Emperours were appointed to doe it. Can Sovereignes ordain any thing in their Dominions concerning *Sacraments* or *Sacrifice*? Can they define any thing in disputable points of doctrine belonging to Religion and Divinity, I mean directly and immediately? I know they have a just power and authority, even from God, over all Ecclesiastical persons, of what quality soever within their Dominions, and over their temporall estates; and may ordain severall things in order to the civil good of their kingdoms, which may indirectly relate to the spiritual government of the Church. But that they have any Jurisdiction and authority purely spiritual, of which doth onely and immediately relate, and is intended to the spiritual good of soules, as in *Sacrifice*, *Sacraments*, &c. that I never took to be a tenet of the Church of *England*. Had we no better nor more convincing arguments to prove the subordination of the *Hierarchy* to be of *Divine right and institution*, then such places of the *Fathers* as he alledgeth (though we honour them as highly, and make at least as much use of them as this Author) we should hardly convince, in this point, the *Calvinist*, *Anabaptist*, or other *Seſſaries*. In fine, he disallowes all appeals from any Primat to *Rome*, saying: *That to a Primat lies the appeals in the last resort, and from him to no other*. First, I suppose he meanes the *right and due of appeales*, which

which by his allegations it seems he would prove. For so learned and well read a man cannot doubt of the *matter of fact*, to wit, that there have been *appeales*, and are daily without number from Primats to the Pope, and have been more commonly in *England* then any where else. And concerning the right of such *appeales*, would I either examine those few places which he alledgeth in favour of his opinion, or produce many others in favour of the contrary practise, I could easily satisfie any impartial man in this point. But this would require a volume, and unfit for a letter.

In his fourth and fifth Chapters (whereof I Chap. 4. & 5. will give you my sentiment both in one paragraph, because they belong to the same subject) first I note, that he grants the Church of *England* did renounce and disclaim the Popes *Supremacy* in *Henry* the 8. his time, and consequently he must surely likewise acknowledge they did separate and divide themselves from the Church of *Rome*, and from all other Churches in *Italy*, *France*, *Spain*, *Germany*, and all other Nations whatsoever, which were in communion with her at that time; that they did, I say, separate themselves, at least in this point, of acknowledging the Pope to be *Head* of the Church, which all the rest of the Churches did maintain as a *substantial* tenet of their Christian believe; And yet those of the Church of *England* are no *Schismaticks*; though in his first chap. pag. 10. he allowes and cites *St. Austins* opinion, That it is not possible there should be any just cause for any to separate from the universal Church.

But this Author will say, *S. Peter* was not constituted *Head and Pastor* of the whole Church, much lesse the Pope his Successors. Whereunto I answer, that I have shewed, as you know, Sir, that there may be a *Schism* and *Schismaticks*, though neither *S. Peter* nor the Pope had been constituted *Head and Pastor* of the universal Church; yea, though both the schismatical parties were united to the Pope as Head of the Church.

Secondly, this Author himself gives a *supremacy* or *firstnesse of precedency*, and consequently, of *presidency* to the Pope; and how much more is allowed him by the universal consent of all Catholicks, as of *Divine Institution*; I am confident he knows not, whatever he may have read in particular Authors. But I would ask him, whether the Pope his *Supremacy* (whatever it is) was not acknowledged and believed in *England*, yea, and in all other Churches in communion with *Rome*, both at the time of their separation, and for many hundred years before? And if so, (which he will not deny) did not they separate themselves from the rest of the whole Church in point generally believed by that universality of a Christians? I know that the ambition of some *Patriarchs*, backed by secular power, hath several times begot contest with, and pretensions against the Popes *Supremacy*. But shall such facts disprove the Popes right? Or can he think his allegations of some few places of the Scripture (expounded by himselfe quite otherwise then they are understood by all the Catholick Authors

Authors of the Roman Catholick Church, who cite them in favour of our *universal* and *infallible* tradition of *S. Peters* Supremacy) or of some few passages of the Fathers spoken upon several occasions, and in unknown circumstances, shall beat down the general belief of the whole Catholick Roman Church?

But suppose, for argument sake, I should give this Author all he demands: As that *S. Peters Supremacy* is not of *divine institution*: That his Successors ought much lessẽ pretend to any such prerogative; were it not therefore a *Schisme* in a *Primat* or National Church, to break out and separate it selfe, not onely from the Popes pretended (and now settled by the prescription of many ages) *Supremacy*; but even from all other Churches in communion with *Rome*? And this both in *substantial* points of faith, and *essential* acts of Religion? That is, in such points and acts as they before their separation did, and all other Churches do believe to be such?

Had this learned and moderate Doctor been fully informed of the true principles whereupon the *infallibility* of our Religion is built, he would not have fallen into these mistakes. Or had he read the Treatises you have translated, I think he would have seen that nothing but *universal tradition* is the *infallible* interpreter of the Scriptures, Councils, and Fathers. That our General Councils are onely witnesses of what we believe; As are the Popes definitions, and the ancient Fathers writings, though in a lower degree. Can he then suppose that his private exposition

of these particular places and passages, can satisfy any rational and impartial man against our Catholick and *infallible tradition* ? This priviledge we give to no learning, to no piety, to no authority in the world. Nor Pope, nor Council shall be heard, if we suppose them (which whether impossible or no, is not material) to teach any thing against universal tradition, either in tenets of *revealed truths*, or in acts of *Divine Institution*.

There be divers other points in these Chapters, which in some sense are true, in others false; which you will easily discover by what I have said in the book you have translated. As that every one of the Apostles authority was, in it selfe, universal, and therefore *in some sort equal* in them all. That neither *S. Peter* was, nor the Pope his Successors are, *universal Bishops*, in his sense. That *S. Peters* Successors have not all the priviledges that *S. Peter* had, and the like. Amongst which I specially noted one, wherein he seems to favour a late opinion of some learned Catholicks, who say, that *S. Peter* and *S. Paul* made but one head of the Church : And this by his conjecturing, that *S. Peter* and *S. Paul* founded two Churches both at *Antioch* and *Rome*, the one of the *Jewes*, the other of the *Gentils*, and consequently were both Bishops at the same time of the same City ; but this by the way only.

As for his argument of the Apostles disposing and settling all things where ever they had preached the Gospel, *S. Peter* never meddling with any thing in those places ; It is in my opinion of ve-

ry small force. Both because we acknowledge all the Apostles to have had their authority and commission immediately from Christ : As also, because there was no need in the Apostles times to have recourse to *S. Peter* ; nay, nor indeed was there any opportunity (ordinarily speaking) or conveniency for it.

He likewise insists much upon *S. Peters* first establishing his Sea at *Antioch*, and thence concludes, that rather *Antioch* then *Rome*, should be the head Sea of the Church:

To satisfy this ordinary and common objection, I could first tell him, that he himself must answer it, having granted a *Primacy of precedent y* to the Bishop of *Rome*, before the Bishop of *Antioch*; but to doe it more fully, I may suppose with his consent, that *S. Peter* was the first, and consequently in some sort the head of the Apostles. Whose headship or power, as first of that Colledge, I will not discusse.

Secondly, that the Bishop of *Rome* is *S. Peters* successor, by a special title above the Bishop of *Antioch*: For though *S. Peter* was Bishop of *Antioch*, yet he left that Sea, and there planted a successor in his own life time (as the rest of the Apostles did in several places) and consequently was no longer Bishop of *Antioch*, but translated his personal Sea, or (if that word be too harsh) made himself afterwards Bishop of *Rome*, as a more convenient place to be Head of the Church, being then esteemed the Head of the World, and the chief seat of Idolatry, as *S. Gregory* the great tell us above a thousand yeares agoe. There he lived

lived and died Bishop, and consequently according to the common phrase of speech, the Bishop of *Rome* is onely and properly *S. Peters* successor. For we generally say, that Bishops succeed after the death of their Predecessors; but not, if they come to transfer their See, and begin a new Bishoprick elsewhere.

Thirdly, we doe not say, that the Pope precisely as Bishop of *Rome* is *S. Peters* successor by *divine right*, but onely by *Apostolical institution*; for it was *S. Peter*, not Christ, who ordained that the Bishops of *Rome* should be his successors.

Fourthly, we say, that the Popes authority, (whatever it be) as *S. Peters* successor, is neither so ample, so infallible, nor so immediate from Christ, as *S. Peters* was.

Fifthly, we acknowledge (which this learned Author seemes most to boggle at, not knowing that 'tis our tenet) that the Pope doth exercise no power nor jurisdiction in the Territories of any Sovereign, without the Soveraignes leave.

And lastly, we doe not believe as an article of our Catholick faith, that there is any particular act of jurisdiction so *essentially* annexed to the Pope, and specified by *divine institution* over all Nations, as that it may not be, in some cases, either performed by others, supplied some other wayes, or quite omitted. If this learned Divine chance to read over the two Chapters of the book you have translated, touching the Popes authority, *lib. 1. c. 9. §. 2.* and *lib. 2. c. 3. §. 3.* he will finde that we doe not hold the Pope precisely as Bishop of *Rome*, to have by *Christs institution*, or

divine

divine right, these priviledges which he labours to disprove, but only as *first, chief, and head* of all Bishops; but I will not now examine, nor determine wherein his *headship* consists, in relation to our purpose. You may note only that this Author himself calls it *Primacy in dignity and order*.

I must likewise advertise this learned Author, that when we speak of all Churches in communion with the Church of Rome (which he takes in an equivocal sense) we mean all Churches whatsoever, who teach all those points of doctrine, and practise all those acts of religion, which the Church of Rome doth believe to be *substantial* and *essential* ones. Nor is there, or ever was there any Church out of communion with the Church of Rome, which doth not, or did not sooner or later, desert and give over believing or practising some article of faith, or act of Religion, which both that Church before its separation, and all the rest of the Church believed to be such.

Another point this Author complains of, wherein he likewise mistakes our principles and practise. That all causes, and cases ought to be judged within the Dominions of each Sovereign; which we in *France* doe, and have ever observed. For notwithstanding our *appeales* from our *Primates* to the *Pope*, yet we suffer not any cause, or case of moment to be determined out of our Kingdome. But in all occurrences we require, that the Bishops of our Nation may be appointed Judges of whatever may be questioned in Rome concerning any of his Majesties subjects. And yet

yet are we far from excluding all Papal authority out of our Realm, or denying the Pope to be *Head of the Church*.

In the sixth Chapter of his book, I finde little to be noted, being it chiefly tends to shew the invalidity of an argument, whereof I make no account at all, and think it unworthy of a learned man to stand upon it; which is, that the Pope hath a particular right in the Kingdome of *England*, because from him, or by his meanes, Christianity hath been planted there. Which at the most, in my opinion, doth prove an ingratitude in that Nation, in becomming his enemies, from whom they received so great a good. One thing I note, which I cannot digest, though it hath but small relation to the Popes Supremacy; which is, That he saith, §. 17. p. 23. first that Kings can *exempt* Ecclesiastical persons from the Jurisdiction of Bishops; which is manifestly injurious to Christ his Institution, who hath *appointed Bishops to govern the Church of God*; and consequently hath subjected unto them in spiritual things purely belonging to Religion, all persons within their precincts; as you have seen in the Treatise you have translated, even in relation to the Pope. And I wonder how this learned Doctor should be of this opinion, being he believes that the subjection of the Presbytery and people to the Bishops, is of *Divine right and institution*, and consequently immutable and *indispensible*, by any authority upon earth.

Secondly (which is worse) that Kings can give *Episcopal jurisdiction* to any such Ecclesiastical persons

persons as he can *exempt*. But I verily believe his mistake proceeds from not distinguishing the several qualities which are ordinarily understood by these words ; *Episcopal jurisdiction* whereof, the *substantial* part is *essentially* annexed to the character. For though in some other respects, we have divers Abbots who are said to have *Episcopal jurisdiction* within their precincts (though perhaps abusively) yet is this to be understood in another manner, then he seems to conceive it. But the explication of particulars in this point, would be too tedious for the present. Besides I know not, whether this divine be of opinion, that all, at least Christian *Kings* and *Soveraignes*, are truly *Bishops*, that is, have truly and supremely all *Episcopal* and *Ecclesiastical* power and jurisdiction, as well as they have a *suprem* civil power and authority. For he saith, § 19. pag. 125. *That the suprem authority of Kings, is over all sorts of causes, even those of the Church, &c.* It may be he meanes, as his words seem to import, that every King is *suprem* judge of all causes and questions any way concerning Christian Religion; As of doctrine belonging to the articles of our divine faith; of the Sacraments, and their administration; and in fine, of all sacred acts, and spiritual functions whatsoever. It may be, I say, he is of learned Mr. *Hobbs* his opinion in this point: And if so, I conceive he had need think of some other meanes to defend and uphold his Church of *England*. If not, his words are equivocal, and therefore demand a further explication.

His seventh chapter contains chiefly an historical relation of matter of fact, which is, of their renouncing and shaking off the Popes authority in *England*. Which he hath patched up with several allegations of words and facts, gathered here and there to his best advantage, omitting all such passages and circumstances, as would prejudice his cause, and which indeed are not only a shame to all Protestants, but even dishonorable to our whole nation. But to examine and rip up particulars in such a foul businesse, I neither intend it, nor are you ignorant of them; you know how often they have been cast in our dish by strangers. Only I will note that he concludes, That though feare should have been the cause, why the Clergy of *England* gave their consent to the renouncing of the Popes authority, yet that the justice of their fact doth still depend upon this, whether the Pope had at that time in *right*, any real authority in *England*, which the King might not lawfully renounce, whereof he himself will be judge against the whole Catholick world. And thus he transferres the question from a visible and palpable *matter of fact*, and of a separation from that whole Church, with whom they were in communion; to a *matter of right*. Wherein again he thinks to make good this *right* by a few citations of several authors collected here and there, against the universal and unanimous belief of all the learned and pious men of the whole Catholick Roman Church.

Then he frames in our behalf an argument from the confession of the Kings of *England*, who have

have given the Popes power over their King dome. But had he read the treatise you have translated, he would not have used this argument; since he would find there, that we acknowledge what one King may have given (especially in any thing belonging to his royalty) another may take away in different circumstances. And therefore, a learned man will hardly make use of any such argument, and consequently doth his *dilemma*, pag. 149. and all his following discourse, falls to the ground.

I would gladly know upon what principles he doth imagine, that the King and Clergy could lawfully reform at the first step, (pag 145.) the number of the Sacraments against the universal belief, of the whole Roman Catholick Church (whereof they were a member, and were in communion before their separation) which held the contrary to be an *essential* article of their faith. Will a few critical conjectures, and uncertain collections, drawn from some few places of divers authors written twelve hundred yeares agoe, justify this fact?

He likewise gives an absolute power and validity, to the acts made by the *Protector* in young King *Edwards* daies. Wherein sure he obligeth no title the *Lord Protector* now Governing; But how advantageously to his English Protestant Church I know not, let him look to it.

In this eighth chapter I must needs confesse, this Chap. 8.
learned Doctor is not like himself. And sure he was either willing to shun the main difficulty in this subject (which neverthelesse he seems to pro-

pose to himself) foreseeing an impossibility to give full Satisfaction therein; or some extraordinary preoccupation doth prevent his judgment which I well suppose is meerly *humane*. First, he states the question amisse. For since he acknowledgeth, that there should be in the Church an *unity* of faith in all those *points of doctrine and traditions*, which were once delivered to the saints (which we call revealed articles of faith) and of *institutions by Christ* (which we call divine institutions) *by the Apostles, and by the universal Church in purest ages*. I did expect from so learned and wise a man, that he should have told us, whether Christ himself had left any *certain* and *infallible* meanes, whereby this unity in points or articles of revealed doctrine, and in acts or practises of divine institution, should be immutably preserved. That then he should have shewed us what this means is, and how *certain* and *infallible*. And lastly, that the Church of *England* is in possession of this meanes. And thus he would have positively concluded against us, like a person of his learning and reading. But instead of this, he will have us to desert *both in bullion and in coin, both in grosse, and in retail*. I know not how many doctrinal tenets, which we hold to be, revealed articles of our Divine faith, and as many essential acts of Christian Religion, which we hold to be of Christs institution, whereof we are and were in possession at the beginning of their reform; yea, and had been, 12. or 13. hundred yeares together, before that time. And now he sends us back to the first 300. yeares for the proof
of

of what we hold upon such an antient tenor. Nay worse, our right to this claim must be shewed him, either out of the Scriptures, whereof he will stand to no mans interpretation, but his own; or out of some few passages of the Councels and Fathers of those times, whereof likewise he will be the expositor, or rather the critike conjecturer, against the universal sentiment of all the learned and pious men of the Roman Catholick Church, who have now, at least these 12. hundred years expounded and understood the very same places and passages which he alleageth, in a quite contrary sense to him. If this be fair play, let any man of common sense be judge.

Now if there be no means left by Christ to his Church, to take up such controversies amongst us, even in the most *substantial* and *essential* points of belief, and practise, in Christian Religion how shall we say, his Church was wisely founded? or well provided for? Especially, seeing Christ himself foretold us, there should come *Schismatics*, yea, that it *was needful there should be heresies*. And sure, if their reform have renounced many articles and practises of the quality now mentioned (as all the rest of the Church, from whom they seperated themselves, do believe) whether they have not made a breach, and consequently a *Schisme* in the unity thereof, I appeal to any man of reason. Would this learned Doctor have every man to seek his faith, and Religion, out of the Authours of the first 300. years? even when the Church lay hid under persecution? what *unity* could he expect from hence? nay what variety

ety and multiplicity of belief and practise in all things *how essential* soever, must there not necessarily follow from this position?

But the meanes (saith he) of *preserving unity* in the Church, was provided by Christ, and by his Apostles, and no way supplanted by their reformation; which he will have to consist in two acts of Apostolical providence. First, in resolving some few heads preached and deposed in every Church of their plantation. Secondly, in subordinating inferior officers to the Bishop; the Bishop to the Metropolitan; the Metropolitan to the Primat. For these two truths you must take his word, which no *Presbyterian, Calvinist, Independent, Anabaptist*, or any other Sectarist whatsoever, will allow to be good; unless he can prove it out of the Scripture (the onely *infallible* rule, (as both they and he say) of their divine beliefs and practise) whereof they think themselves as *infallible* Interpreters as he. Nor truly do I think my self obliged no more then they to believe, that his word must bear water against the whole Roman Catholick Church.

Secondly, how shall we certainly and *infallibly* know (for if we may be in an error, all is undone) that those heads, whereof he speaks, were but few? Or, who shall certainly, and *infallibly* tell us which they are? And whether all of them, or which of them, are of *essential* necessity, so as they must not be denied? And how will he demonstrate, I doe not say *sceptically* and *problematically*, but *clearly* and *evidently*, that his subordination doth finally rest in a Primat? And this

this by *divine right*, and by *Christs institution*? And how will he prove all this out of the Scripture alone? yea, and this evidently against the universal sentiment and belief of the Roman Catholick Church? It is strange to see into what unlikely, not to say extravagant, persuasions, the education and other interested dispositions of men do carry even the wisest.

As for the historical passages which he alledgeth to the same effect, they will be of no force, to whomsoever shall please to think, that they are neither of infallible authority, nor well cited and understood. They are ridiculous to the Presbyterian and Sectary, and would be of small weight to the Roman Catholick, were he not in actual possession of as much as is true, by the means of *universal tradition*.

It evidently followes out of this learned Authors doctrine, that how many *Primats* soever there be in the world, they are all free from being *Schismaticks*. For though we should suppose them all to be now actually of one believe, and that they should separate themselves into as many several Sects, both in points of revealed doctrine, and in practises of divine institution, as there be *Primats*, yet were they not *Schismaticks* in his opinion, because they have no Superior, as I have already said. But to remedy this inconvenience, he would have a General Council called. Whereunto I must reply and tell him, that that were impossible. For seeing that all Kings and Sovereignes may chuse (at least according to his principles) whether they will either send their Ambassadors

bassadors to it, or suffer the Bishops of their Kingdomes (their subjects) to goe thither : As also, seeing it would certainly fall out, that the interests of some Soveraignes, perhaps of many, would not stand in all circumstances with the concurrence of such an assembly ; it would certainly follow, that the Bishops of several *Primacies* or Nations, would be absent, and consequently that it would not be esteemed a General Council, if there could be any assembly at all.

Secondly (omitting to examine the nature and quality of a General Council in this learned Doctors opinion, which I know not what it is) though all these Bishops should go to the Council, yet may every *Primat* stand out if he please. In which case their *Suffragans* are obliged (in his opinion) to side with their *Primat* ; and so there may still remaine as many *Schismes* as *Primats*. Whereby it doth appear, how needful it is to have a *head* and general Pastor over the universal Church, by whose fatherly care over the whole body, and charitable correspondence with all Soveraignes, such an *Oecumenical Synod* may be called and procured. Wherefore it is manifest, that nothing but a total submission of every member, of what quality soever, to the rest of the whole, can settle or preserve *union* in the Church : Nor consequently can any member, of what quality soever, separate it selfe from the rest of the whole, especially in such things as we speak of, without making a *Schism*.

Reading this ninth Chapter, I was much edified to see Doctor *Hammond* his moderation, or
at

at least his seeming willingnesse of *union* with the Church of *Rome*, if his conscience would permit him. Yet I must needs tell him, that if his conscience be erroneous (as we are certain it is) that will not excuse his fault. Besides, he comes not home to the point, when he speaks of external communion: For we ought not onely to be united in all points of belief, which are of divine revelation, that we may be truly said to be all of one Church; but it is likewise necessary, that we participate one with another, in all *essential* acts of Religion, as particularly in Sacrifice and Sacraments, without which, clear it is, no two Churches can be truly said to be of the same communion. For example, a stranger comes into *France*, of what nation soever you please, and if he be a Roman Catholick, he presently goes to Mass, to the Sacrament of Penance, to the holy Eucharist, and to other like *substantial* acts of Religion with the Roman Catholicks in *France*; And he is therefore truly said to live in communion, or to be of the same communion with them. The same may be said of a Frenchman going into *Germany*, or elsewhither. But if an English or German Protestant, or any other Sectary come into *France*, he will not doe the like, and therefore cannot be truly said to be of the Roman Catholick Communion. Nay perhaps such an English or German Protestant will not thus communicate with the *Hugonots* of *France*; nor reciprocally a French *Hugonot* with the Protestants of *England*, nor of *Germany*. And therefore, we may peradventure say, that *they* neither, are of the same

communion. The like may be said of all men whomsoever, professing the name of Christ, who have in several ages, and upon several occasions, gone out from the Roman Catholick Church, and remain thus separated.

But this Author saith, he will referre himselfe to the *umpirage of any rational Arbitrator*, to be judged out of the Scriptures, Councils, and Writers, of the first three hundred yeares. I confesse I wonder, so rational a man should make such a proposition. Who must this *rational Arbitrator* be? what security shall we have of his determination? what grounds must his sentence be built upon? No, no, what confusion, disorder, disunion, debates, dissensions, and disputes must there not necessarily arise and follow out of this principle in all things belonging to Religion, he himself shall be Judge betwixt him and me.

Chap. 19.

In his tenth Chapter I find little whereof I can give you any account to our purpose, being it treats of the particular vertue of charity, which may be wounded, and is too too often, by men of the same perswasion in Religion, as well as of different professions and perswasions. Yet I perceive by his discourse of *our judging of Protestants*, that he is not fully informed of the truth of our tenet (as it is Catholick, and certainly believed by all) in this point. I confesse I am of opinion, that some Catholicks have been, and are too forward in judging of Protestants, whose writings I suppose he hath specially noted. You know, Sir, what I have said of that point, and how hardly I undertake to judge of any man in particular.

As

As for *despising* of Protestants, I am sure all good Catholics are far from it, being unworthy of the name of a Christian, to condemn any man.

What he writes in his last and eleventh Chapter, I shall easily allow him; which is, supposing it is not absolutely necessary, that every particular Christian live in communion with some visible Church, I say, somewhere visible. There may be a particular English Protestant, who, if we look only upon this consideration, may be excusable; yea, and may be so after there shall remain in *England* neither any Protestant Bishop, nor any Common-prayer book, either publick or private. Being all this may happen without such a particular mans fault. But how safe it is to live in a Church of this constitution, wherein this may, and is like to happen ere long, let every Protestant seriously reflect upon it, and consider how well Christs promises to his dear Spouse, the true Church, do correspond with such a congregation. You will not believe, Sir, how passionately perverse, and how vehemently incensed against Catholics, I have generally found our English Protestants, since their fall from, and prohibition of the publick exercise of their reformed service. What Gods designs are over that Kingdome I know not, but sure I am, there can be no one permanent form of Religion, grounded upon the principles of their reform. They will ever be reforming one another (their fancies being not tied to any known certainty) until there be (as I fear) no Christian Religion at all.

Thus, Sir, in haste; you know my function and

employments doe so take up all my time, that I have not leasure to answer, though I would, all the particulars of the Treatise you sent me. Nor doe I think it fit, being replies to citations, and the allegations of others opposite thereunto, would rather embroyl then clear the subject in dispute. There is no man of an ordinary wit and learning, but shall say something, if so resolved, against the most evident and manifest truth that can be imagined. What more clear then that the Protestants of *England* did leave, goe out of, and separate themselves in Communion from the Church of *Rome*. And yet you see what this Author (recurring to the Scriptures, and to the Councils, and Fathers of the purest times, the first 300. years) can pretend against such an evident truth. Assure your self he could do as much, if need were, against this truth, *That every whole is bigger then any part of it*, so you will give him leave to argue out of the authority of *Plato*, *Aristotle*, and the rest of the ancient Philosophers. I never yet heard of any thing so absurd, but something may be said in its defence.

Your friend will shew you a paper of mine of a neer relation to this question; which you may quickly read over for your further satisfaction, if you think it worthy your labour. In the interim I hope you will excuse my haste, and assure your self you shall ever find me in what I am able

SIR,
Paris this first of May
1654.

Your most humble and truly affectionate
servant in Christ Jesus,
HOLDEN.

P O S T S R I P T.

Just as I was going to lap up this letter, there came to my hands another book of the same subject, written by the Protestant Bishop of *Derby*; which I was willing to read over, before I would seal up your letter. That, if need were, I might give you notice of what this Author hath particularly added, or insisted upon more then the other. And I must tell you, that this piece is of a different nature from that of Doctor *Hammonds*. Doctor *Hammond* writes more closely, and strikes still at the point of the question, though he mistakes in its resolution. This of the Protestant Bishops is more historical, fuller of matter of fact, especially modern, and his ratiocination ordinarily runs in more general and common terms, and therefore subject to an equivocal ambiguity, because he doth not sufficiently specify, and distinguish in what sense he takes his words. Yet I must doe him the right to acknowledge he hath made a collection of very many, very material, and very curious passages, both of ancient and modern proceedings, which you shall hardly find elsewhere. I will give you some few and general notes of what I remarked in the reading of it, in relation to the subject of their *Schism*.

First, Sir, I wondred to see the Title of his book, which is to *vindicate his Church from criminal Schism*. I never yet heard of an innocent *Schism*, if truly and formally a *Schism*. Nor would
 Doctor

Doctor *Hammond* allow of such a word, he sure takes this term in a material sense. He may say the like of heresie, drunkenesse, whoredome, &c. because in some particular cases and circumstances they may not have the nature of those vices as they are in an individual action. As to believe an heresie, not knowing it to be such; to be overcome with the draught of an inebriating potion, not knowing it would have such an effect; or to defile another mans bed, thinking it to be his own. But that schism, heresie, drunkenesse, whoredome, &c. are not essentially criminal, of and in their own nature, and therefore never innocent, that I understand not. Sure I am, that the very same title applyed to other vices, might prove to be of no small prejudice to many an ignorant man. But I will not insist upon many particulars, I will onely put you in mind of some general notions, which are in the Treatise you have translated, and which doe evacuate the force of the greatest part of this treatise of the Bishop.

First we may suppose, that it is needlesse, and to no purpose for a Roman Catholick to contest and maintain against the Protestants any other point, either of doctrine or practise, but onely such as the whole Catholick Church doth believe to be revealed and infallible truths. And thence exclude from disputes with them, all opinions of what nature and subject soever, which are not unanimously and universally agreed upon amongst our selves. And the reason is evident, because one may become, or remain a Roman Catholick, and yet

yet hold in these points whether side he pleaseth.

Secondly, it is to be noted, that though all Roman Catholicks do acknowledge the Bishop of Rome to be constituted *head* of the Church by divine right, and consequently, that he ought to have a fatherly care over all Christians : yet, wherein his *headship* doth consist, and what power his Primacie doth comprehend by *Christs institution*, is uncertain amongst us Catholicks ourselves. This authour useth the word, *universal jurisdiction* which is equivocal, and which unlesse well understood, many Catholicks will tell him, the Pope hath it not by *Divine institution*. What power and authority may be accrewed to the Sea of Rome by humane confessions, is little to our purpose : being we acknowledge, that may be as justly taken away, as it was given. Besides, it is a common tenet amongst our Divines, and of some whole Catholick Nations, That the Pope cannot exercise any act of jurisdiction, of what nature soever, without the leave of the supream civil power of the Nation, nor without the consent of the Bishops thereof. This author alloweth the Pope a *Primacy* or *headship* both of *precedency* and *presidency*, which is at least a *superiority of order* : what more is universally allowed him by all Catholicks, as an *article of our divine and infallible faith*, I am confident he cannot tell.

Thirdly, we shall not disagree with him, in acknowledging that the King, or supream civil power, is the *political head* of the Church within his Dominions, that is, of the Christian Pastors & people

people, of what quality soever. Who ever doubted but that the Clergy and laity are the Kings subjects? And he their supream governour in civil affaires? yea, and that he hath power from God, over their persons as his subjects? And that he is supream judge in many cases relating to Ecclesiastical discipline. And further, that as he is obliged to protect his subjects, and provide for their common good, so may he lawfully hinder the execution (when need is) of any act whatsoever proceeding or issuing from any forraign power. In so much, that neither Pope nor Prelate, no not even the generals of Religious orders can dispose of the Kings subjects, without his leave and consent. Which supposed I would gladly know, what this authour can blame in those places of the *Appendix of Schisme* which he citeth pag. 106. and in my following pages. I am sure I allow as much power to all Sovereignes as he, in order to the preservation of their temporal estates, only I allow not their revolt from that Catholick Church, whereof, they are, or were members, especially in such points of doctrine and practise as were and are held to be substantial and assential articles of Religion by the same Church. Nor do we need, to live in *Plato's common wealth*, to see and make use of this doctrine. But against this evident truth, this authour brings many *iss*s, and suppositions, saying: *what if the Bishop and court of Rome &c. or have usurped, &c. Or have engrossed &c. and many other* such hypothetical, *or haves*, which surely should be proved, and not barely supposed and asserted. For
thus

thus he might have done better, by saying in a word; *what if we be no schismaticks?* And so put an end to the dispute. These phrases are fitter for a pulpit before an ignorant and credulous auditory, then for a schoole before learned Divines. Yet he goes on and proves what he allegeth out of my *Appendix*, but saith, I am wide of the case, which he approves again, with a *what if the Bishop of Rome, &c.* Truly, this is a new method of arguing, and would be admired in our Sorbon. I think I proved what I proposed both throughout the whole book, and in that particular place of the *Appendix*, whereof he hath not as much as taken notice in all his Treatise.

Fourthly, to be sure to demonstrate their separation to be *Schisme and criminal*, without possibility of any apparent excuse, you know I expressly shunned to choose for my *medium*, their revolt from, and renouncing of the Popes authority; because, how clear soever the case is to the world, yet I foresaw that way of dispute would embroyle the question; knowing well enough what our adversaries might pretend upon that subject, especially in matter of fact, depending upon uncertain historical circumstances both in relation to the Popes universal jurisdiction, and to his proceedings against *England* in the beginning of their separation. But I struck at the more *substantial* part of their *Schisme*, which I was sure they could not deny. Which is, that they had deserted the Roman Catholick Church, whereof they were members in divers most *essential* points of doctrine and practise; That is, such

M m m

points

points as both they, before their seperation, & the whole Roman Catholick Church, had for many hundred years believed, and practised as most essential acts of Religion. This cannot be denyed, the particulars you know are specified in the book you have translated; and if this be not the most *formal and criminal schisme* that can be, I confesse I know not what *schisme* is. But not a word to this in all his book, save only, that now and then he talks of *superstructures*, in common and general termes. And for the proof thereof, gives us a larger field then Dr. Hammond doth. He only sends us a thousand years back to the first 600. years; whereas Dr. Hammond more cautious, will allow only the first 300. whereof I have already told you my mind. Now, Sir, by this authours leave, *with all due respect to his person, to his learning, to his moderation, and to his charity*, I hope my position cited by him, is sufficiently evident. For being I know no *schisme* (if properly *schisme*) but such is *criminal*, I must needs think theirs to be such. The separations he mentions are not *schismes*, but only in an equivocal and material sense, as I have told you already. I verily believe this author was unwilling to take notice of what I most urged and insisted upon, I mean their separation in *substantial* points of belief and practise, being clearly convinced, it is wholly unanswerable. For to remit all sorts of Christians to resolve these points out of the Scriptures, Councils, and Fathers, of the first 300. or first 600. years, doth not become a rational man, as I have already shewed you.

Fifthly

Fiftly, we acknowledge, that all the Apostles, as well as *S. Peter*, had an absolute and supreme power and authority given them immediately from Christ, and this without limitation of places or persons. It is true, *S. Peters* was their head, and the first of the Colledge. For it was necessary there should be a subordination at least, of order, amongst them; though their power was in some sort equal. But what *jurisdiction* *S. Peter* had over the rest of the Apostles, we do not certainly know by *divine revelation*. We likewise say, that all true Bishops are the Apostles successors, as the Pope is *S. Peters*; And they have jurisdiction and authority, essentially annexed to their order, immediately from Christ, and not from the Pope, whose Bulls for the ordination of Bishops, are not of *divine institution*, nor were they in use of the primitive times, though good and convenient as long as well used.

Now Sir, if you would take out of this authours book, or passe over as not decisive in this question, all the points that he disputes against these and divers other tenets and practises, which are doubtfully disputed amongst our Catholick authours, & which consequently make no breach in communion with the Roman Church (to what height soever their disputes grow) I am confident there would not remain three sheets of paper in the whole treatise; which neverthelesse, I esteem a learned peece, and a curious research, though little to the dicision of the question he should handle. But to give you some account of particulars, he buildeth his treatise upon six proposi-

tions, whereof I will briefly tell you my opinion.

His first proposition is, that *Protestants were not the authours of their separation from Rome, but the Catholicks themselves.* Which truly whether they were or no, is not material. Was there ever any heresie or schism in the Church, which was not first begun by Catholicks? Must we suppose there were Protestants in *England* before there was any separation? which is as much as to say, before there were any Protestants? or any men that maintained or knew what Protestant doctrine was? And though his relation of this businesse, I mean, how their *Schisme* first began, be very lame and imperfect in many respects, too long to declare; yet suppose, I say, (as needs we must) that they were Catholicks who first brok the Ice and opened the gap to their going out from us (as *Luther* and *Calvin* were Catholicks and Priests before they were hereticks) doth this excuse either their *schisme* in itself, or in the following *Schismatics*? After many suppositions expressed in equivocal termes, and therefore not to be admitted until their sense be cleared, he tells you that *Schisme* is a *criminous scissure in the Church.* Can there be any *schisme* in the Church which is not *criminous*, if it be in *substantial* points either of doctrine or practise (as you know we have shewed, theirs is) or in refusal of mutual participation and communion with each other in Sacrifice, Sacraments, or any *essential* act of religion through want of charity? When therefore he shall have proved, that they have separated and divided themselves from the *Roman Church* (to say nothing

thing of their renouncing of the Popes authority neither in *substantial* points of doctrine and practise (I still call *substantial* points, all those which were esteemed to be such by their predecessors for many hundred years before their separation; and are still esteemed such by all that live in communion with the Church of Rome, nor that they refuse to communicate with the Roman Catholick Church in Sacrifice, Sacraments, and other *essential* acts of Religion (I still call *essential* acts of Religion, all those which have been, and are esteemed such as above.) When, I say, he shall have clearly proved this, I will not only acknowledge their separation to be no *criminous schism*; but also, that it is no *schism* at all. Wherefore, he mistakes when he conceives that it is not the *separation*, but the cause that makes a *schism*. For the cause may be a political quarrel, or a passionate animosity indifferent, though uncertain and nearly probable, opinions, or several other motives of enmity and hatred. But it is the *separation* itself wherein the *Schisme* doth *essentially* consist; whether it proceed from disobedience, or for want of charity; or in fine, (which is the worst of all) that it fall out to be in substantial points of doctrine, or practise belonging to Religion; whereof the particular separatour, who goeth out from the rest of the whole, nor ought, nor can ever be a competent judge.

When he would tell us, wherein the communion of the Christian Catholick Church doth consist, pag. 14. He tells you first of an internal

com-

communion, which is nothing to our purpose.

We cannot judge of mens hearts. There may be amongst us Jewes Turks, Atheists, if we saw into their minds, who exteriorly profess the name of Christ, and live in communion with us. *Schism* relates only to the external profession and actions of men. But then he tells you of an external communion, which he would have to consist,

1. In the profession of the three Creeds, Apostolick, *Nicene*, *Athanasian*.
2. In the participation of the same Sacraments.
3. In the same external worship of the same divine office, Liturgies, and formes of serving God.
4. In the same publick rites and ceremonies.
5. In communicatory letters.
- And 6. in admission of the same discipline.

Would he and his Protestant Church stand to this, there were an end of the controversie. If they would allow all these to be necessary and essential points of communion (as we believe they are) I am sure they could not be said to communicate with any Church in the world. But when he comes to discusse these points in particular, he leaves not any one of them to be of *essential necessity* to external communion. So that I know not where to fix my foot, nor take an acknowledged principle whereupon to build an argument against his non-coinmunion. For he neither acknowledgeth any thing in particular to be an *essential* and necessary point of communion; nor will he be judged by any but himself, in what he sometimes seems to assert as *necessary*; for he ever supposeth something or other that may warrant his words. For example

ple ; To separate (saith he) a mans self from all other Christians in the participation of the same Sacraments, is no *Schisme*, so it be done upon sufficient grounds which grounds, whether they be sufficient or no, he will be judge, or send us to the first 600. yeares, there to quarrel at his pleasure with doubtful conjectures to no end. And thus he is forced to discourse all the way in voluntary suppositions, and fained exceptions, whence nothing can be concluded.

I longed much to see what he would make of the *Catholick Church* (out of the pale whereof, he saith, ther's no *salvation* ordinarily to be had) which he tells us is, *the whole Church of Christ spread a broad throughout the whole world*. What this signifies God he knowes, I confesse I do not. As I could not discover wherein he placed the *substantial* and *essential communion* necessary amongst all Christian Churches: So was I now as farr to seek wherein he conceiveth the *Catholick Church* doth consist. He told us, *none are to be excluded from the Catholick communion, nor Eastern nor Western, nor Southern nor Northern Christians, so they believe the same entire substance of saving necessary truths revealed by the Apostles*. &c. But he told us not which these truths be ; where they are to be *certainly* found, who can tell us *infallibly* which they are ; who shall be judge amongst us, who doth believe these truths, and who not. And we are now fallen again into the like case ; who shall tell us whether this *Catholick Church* of his be *one* or *many*, wherein consists its *essential unity* in relation either to doctrine or practise ? will he

he exclude none who professe the name of Christ of what doctrine or practise soever? Be there any *Hereticks* or *Schismaticks* in the *Catholick Church*? who are they? Are they truly members or no of his *Catholick Church*? why are they so? Or why are they not so? How shall we *certainly* know them? His answer to these, and the like questions must be evident beyond exceptions, otherwise we shall still remain doubtful, and live in division. Certainly he must needs make his *Catholick Church* of a large extent, being he often tells us the *Roman Catholick Church*, is but a fourth part of it. How many *Christian Churches* doth he find there are, not *Roman Catholicks*, and yet such as he will include as members of his *Catholick Church*, in all *America*, *Asia*, and *Africa*. Surely, there are either very few, or he must take strange *Christians* into his *Catholick Church*. May I not suppose he will include the *Tartarians*, the *Muscovits*, the *Transylvanians*, the *Russians*, and in a word, all the *Northern parts* of the world, so they do but talk of *Jesus Christ*. Is there no essential breach, and substantial solution of continuity in the exterior *Ecclesiastical body*, amongst all these? is this whole body of his *Catholick Church*, so united and knit together with nerves and ligaments, as that there are no essential ruptures, no substantial divisions, no fundamental rents amongst all these supposed *Christians*? I confesse I wonder how such learned and understanding men, can either satisfie themselves or think to satisfie others with empty and unexamined words.

In fine Sir, this Author never telling us, nor deter-

determining who shall be Judge of all he proposeth, leaves us in the dark; for to talk of *fundamentals of the Catholick Church*; of the *obedience to Superiors*; of *General Councils*; of *ancient truths revealed by the Apostles*; of *Schism*; of *Heresie*; of *Orthodox Christians*; of *necessary saving truths*: and of a thousand such like termes in general, and never to tell us how we may presently agree upon any one of these points, is in effect to talk in the aire. But I will not, Sir, entrench so much upon your patience, as to give any further account of his long discourse, pag. 31. &c. whereby he labour-eth to prove his first proposition, I mean, that *their separation was first made by Catholicks*. Both because it is full of relations of many particular facts, which would require whole volumes to examine them precisely; but chiefly because they are in effect little to our purpose, as I have already noted.

The whole drift of his treatise is only in defence of their revolt from the Pope; and this again in relation to the Popes *universal jurisdiction*; which is an equivocal word, and yet he never distinguisheth it. He might according to his grounds acknowledge the Pope *head of the Church*; and then dispute, what the Pope could do in vertue of his *headship*. But not a word in all his book of the chief and main part of their *Schisme* which you know I only urged in my *Appendix*, though he have read it, as appears by his citing of it.

As for the practises and proceedings of the Popes in and against *England*, both before, and at

the time of their *Schisme*, I neither think it necessary to examine them nor doe I approve all that was done. Muchlesse will I excuse the disorders of the court of *Rome*, which this author doth generally insist upon. But I must needs say, I am sorry he conceiveth the laws of *England* against Roman Catholicks, are not cruel. God forgive him, and others who are of that opinion? All *Europe* can witness how true it is. I am sure I could never approve of bloody proceedings against any Christian whomsoever, if only for Religion sake, much lesse if colored under the vail of laws.

His second proposition is, *That their separation from Rome was only a vindication of their old laws, &c. pag. 54.* But whether there have not been new laws enacted against the acknowledging of the Popes being head of the Church, at the time of, and since there separation; And whether there was ever any antient law which either denied, or prohibited to give this title to the Pope, he himself shall be judge. But he runs wholly upon another strain, and disputes against the Popes antient exercising of any jurisdiction in great *Britain* without the Kings leave. Wherein he swarves from, or at least waves the main point of the controversie, and contests a question wherein we shall not differ much from his opinion, if well understood; And therefore, there's little to be noted to our purpose in the proof of his second position, though there be very many remarkable passages of history.

His third and fourth positions I will joyn together

gether, which are; *That the British Churches were exempt from all forraign jurisdiction during the first 600. years; And that the King and Church of England had sufficient grounds and authority to withdraw their obedience; yea, and that they did it with moderation.* Which he labours to prove from pag. 87. to pag 160. Wherein I first noted, Sir, that I found very little matter of doctrine, contrary to our Catholick belief. Some mistakes I conceive there be in his citations now and then, both in words and facts, but chiefly in his application of them; which seem not to be of that importance, as that they need to be discussed; especially considering they are concerning things spoken by the bye, and done upon several occasions, some 1400. some 1300. or at least 1000. years agoe. And therefore involving many critick uncertainties; whereof he himself doth rightly complain elsewhere against *Monsieur Blondel*. But what is truly cited out of the Councils, and Canons, is nothing but Roman Catholick doctrine, at least nothing against any point which is *Catholick* amongst us. Only you may note, that he shelters all he saith under these common and general terms of the Popes *universal jurisdiction by divine right*, and consequently independent of any Kings leave, or National Councils consent. Wherein not distinguishing in these equivocal words, what is believed as a *Catholick truth* amongst us, from what is the opinion of some particular divines, his whole discourse is void of force, in relation to the due subject of his treatise. Though I must still acknowledge, you will find

many historical passages very worthy your reading.

His first proposition is, *That all Princes and Republicques of the Roman communion, doe in effect the same they did.* Which he proves from pag. 160. to pag. 229. And truly it is a very curious collection, and shews how watchful his zeal hath been in his travels, to enquire into the quarrels of Princes with the Pope and the Court of Rome. Yet I could have helped him to much more, then it seems he hath heard of. I found nothing of moment to give you notice of in his discourse of this subject. But first that it toucheth nothing at all the *Schism* I proposed in my *Appendix*; that is, either a separation in *essential* points of doctrine and practise, or of non-communication in *essential* acts of Religion, through want of charity. Secondly, none of the Emperors, Kings, Republicks, or Sovereignes, whose lawes and actions he citeth, did ever disallow the Popes being head of the Church, or quite abolish out of their Dominions the Popes jurisdiction, as he himsele acknowledgeth, pag. 184. which the English Protestants did. Thirdly, these proceedings cited by him, be of no use at all to his design. For were the Protestant Church re-established again in England under their head the King, they might for ought I know do as much as any he citeth in relation to the Pope and Court of Rome, so they would go no further. And thus they might live in communion with the Church of Rome, as all those Kings, Republicks, and Sovereignes do, whose priviledges and proceedings against the Pope and Court of Rome he produceth

ceth. I will not say, but that some Emperours and other Sovereignes have exceeded their due respect to their Christian and Catholick Pastors; whose spiritual Functions and Authority in sacred things, is of a higher nature then that of Kings and Emperours. But many other times they have done nothing but what was necessary and lawful; whereof I will not discusse particulars, lest I should be too troublesome.

His sixth and last proposition is, *That the Pope and Court of Rome are most guilty of Schisme*, which he treateth from pag. 229. to pag. 244. He proves this first by the Church of Rome its exalting it self, that is, the Pope and Court of Rome. But why should this have provoked them to separate themselves in communion, not onely from the Pope and Court of Rome, but even from all other Churches in communion with them both? Why at that time and never before? Why did not at the same time many other National Churches do so too? why could they not free themselves, as he saith other Nations doe, from the Popes jurisdiction within their Dominions, and yet continue still in communion with him, as those other Nations doe? They should rather have united themselves more strictly with those other Churches, whereby they might have banded more strongly against the Popes usurpation (if he did usurp) rather then divide

vide themselves from all other Churches, as well as from the Pope, in sacrifice and Sacraments, and in the greatest part of their Christian believe. Suppose the Popes proceedings gave them some sort of occasion to deliver themselves from his tyranny, must they therefore break commerce with him, and with all other Churches in communion with him; and this, in the most *essential* points of Christian Religion? The like may be said of what he pretends against the Court of Romes obtruding *new Creeds, new Articles of faith, and new subjection to the Pope*. All which are but vain and voluntary suppositions, against the believe and practise of all the rest of the Church with whom they lived in communion before their separation. And that, that which he saith is true, you must still take his word; for other prooffe he brings none. Nay, he proves the contrary in regard of our subjection to the Pope, shewing that all Catholique States doe in effect render as much of this subjection, as is of absolute necessity, void of danger and of no prejudice to them. Why could not they doe so? Which if they might have done (as surely they might) shall we therefore say, the Pope and Court of Rome, though they had given them some occasion to provide for their freedome, were the cause of their falling into such *essential Separations, and substantial Schisms*, from the whole Church? The rest of his flashing language, as of striking

king topfaile to the Popes Crosse-keyes; of buying trinkets at Rome, &c. is little to the purpose, and not very befitting a grave and wise man. As are also the rest of his suppositions, to wit, of the *Popes superiority over General Councils*, which is no part of our believe, as he himself doth remark: Much lesse, that the Pope hath *a sole legislative power, or a negative voice*. So that his whole discourse of the Council of *Constance*, is no way pertinent to this subject, whatever the truth be. The same is to be said of his supposition, that the Pope makes himselfe the *only Bishop of the world*. Which you know how farre we are from believing, by what you have translated: Of the Popes giving *exemptions*: Of the Title of *Universal Bishop*. These, and some such other Tenets which he produceth, being he himself doth say, *they are not defined by our Church*, I will not trouble you with them, as not fit for this place nor subject. If he have a mind to dispute such probable questions, and unagreed-upon points of doctrine, I must remit him to our Schools.

Finally, he concludes his Treatise with an answer to some slight objections, brought, saith he, by the Romanists, but weakly urged, and equivocally answered: *As that they separated themselves from the communion of the Catholick Church*. Which how true soever, unlesse it be first agreed upon what *com-*
munion

munition signifies, and what the *Catholic Church* is, there can be nothing certainly deduced from thence, though the objection be a most convincing argument. Nor can he think, that the answer he gives thereunto of, *God forbid*, would prove satisfactory to any understanding man. But indeed there can be no solid and certaine discourse, or conclusion of any thing, where men doe not first agree upon terms.

Then he objecteth to himselfe, their disobedience to the Council of *Trent*, which in my opinion, cannot be decisive to the question, until we have first agreed wherein a lawful General Councell doth consist; And that we then prove that the Council of *Trent* was such an one; otherwise certainly we doe but wrangle in the air.

His objection of their substracting their obedience from their lawfull Patriarch, is not, as I conceive, worthy discussion. All the rest of his discourse, is rather a confused invective against the abuses of the Court of *Rome*, sometimes true, sometimes false; then any serious and solid answer to the main point of their *Schisme*; which he might, if he had pleased (though he doth it in all his book) have taken notice of, since that he had read it in the *Appendix* you have translated.

After

After this *Cannon-shot*, he brings a *small volley of muskets* (those be his termes) which truly were not like to wound as they are shot. Whether and wherein they have left the Communion of their Ancestours, I will leave it to the world to judge, after what I have already said.

Whether they judge, that their Catholick Ancestours, for at least a thousand yeares before their Separation, were all damned or no, truly I know not, nor is it material. Yet if we Roman Catholicks have any damnable errours amongst us, I know not how they can well judge otherwise, generally speaking; And if not, they were too blame to go out from us.

Their Ordination of Bishops, whether valid or no (whereof Master *Masson*, whom he cites, hath been sufficiently answered by our learned and pious Countryman Master *Anth. Champney*, Doctor of the Sorbon) I doe not conceive it to be of any great moment. For if they be truly *Schismaticks*, and maintaine divers Heresies (as all we Roman Catholicks doe most certainly believe) it imports not how valid their Consecration be. What matter, forme, and Minister are essentially required to a valid ordination, I fear he will hardly be able to prove against *Monsieur Blondel*. Nay I am sure he cannot answer him,

O o o

nor

nor satisfie any rational man in this point, valesse he will have recourse to *universal tradition*, and that to be taken from the mouth of the present Roman Catholick Church; being that all Christians, in that extent whereof he seemes to make his Catholick Church, doe not agree in any thing at all upon this subject. And to fetch the resolution and determination of this point from the Primitive Writers of the first three hundred, or the first six hundred yeares (wherein he will find very little of this subject, and nothing at all decisive of the point) is in effect to set men by the ears together, where there is either zeal or interest.

But the truth is, Sir, a few yeares will, in all likelyhood, put an end to this controverſie. The present State of the Protestant Church, consisting of Protestant Bishops, and their Protestant Flock, not being like to continue long. God of his mercy give them grace to see the condition they are in, and a will to unite themselves to that Church, which Christ hath promised shall last to the worlds end, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

I crave your pardon, Sir, if I have been too long, which you know is not my ordinary fault, both by reason I am willingly very short in what ever I discourse of; as also because
I am

(471)

I am alwayes full of businesse, and therefore
rest as ever

Paris, 3d. 1654.

The same,

MOLDEN.

FINIS.

The table of errors in the impression.

Page 1. ANALASYS read ANALYSIS and so through the whole book. P. 12. In the marginal note nformed. r. informed. p. *ibid.* lin. 12. absosutely. r. absolutely. p. 29. the first lessn. r. the only lesson. p. 37. lin. .dee be. p. 48. lin. 13. dele by. p. 50. in the marginal note truth. r. truths. p. 51. lin. 31. xample. r. example. p. 54. in the marginal note sense. r. the sense. p. 72. lin. 31. pies. r. copies. p. 84. lin. 9. dele that. p. 102. l. 22. pcedent. r. precedent. p. 103. l. 20. was. r. way. p. 106. l. 4. connection. r. connection. p. 110. The first lesson. r. the third lesson. p. 113. l. 10. hfs. r. his. p. 116. in the marginal note dele things. p. 118. l. 7. praying r. praying. p. 119. l. 21. de dele. p. 124. l. 10. article. r. articles. p. 125. l. 30. ths. r. the. p. 130. l. 23. eximine. r. examine. *ibid.* l. 28. any lesse. r. any wayes lesse. p. 139. l. 7. imports much. r. imports not much. p. 142. l. 3. interrupted. r. uninterrupted. p. 143. l. 10. doth. r. doe. p. 152. l. 4. ha dele. *ibid.* l. 22. fane. r. frame. p. 157. l. 31. divinity. r. divinely. p. 159. l. 1. delare r. declare. p. 163. l. 28. never. r. ever. p. 174. l. 2. comfortable. r. conformable. *ibid.* l. 19. learned by our. r. by our learned. p. 172. l. 26. we are. r. we have. p. 176. l. 7. design. r. define. p. 181. l. 20. tises. r. ses. p. 186. l. 28. faselly. r. falsely. p. 189. l. 3. fellows. r. followers. *ibid.* in the marginal note *Athanasius*. r. *Athanasian*. P. 194. l. 26. Dionisius Arro pagita. r. Dionisius Ariopagita p. 195. l. 12. Theodretus. r. Theoderetus. p. 197. Hypostares. r. Hypostases. p. 200. l. 3. no dele. p. 206. l. 28. forreraries. r. sectaries: P. 2116. l. 4. expecting. r. excepting. p. 221. l. 6. expended. r. expounded. p. 283. l. 7. improved. r. disproved. p. 321. l. 25. desume. r. asume. p. 246. l. 6. there is any thing. r. in any thing. p. 415. l. 15. fought. r. to ought. *ibid.* l. 28. law. r. love. p. 425. l. 1. whom. r. home. p. 426. l. 29. title. r. little.

